00069341

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

00069341

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 11 March, 2020

THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

BY

R. G. LATHAM, A.M.

FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; PROFESSOR OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

6 c 341

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR TAYLOR AND WALTON,
BOOKSELLERS AND PUBLISHERS TO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
UPPER GOWER STREET.

1841.

TO

THE REV. WILLIAM BUTCHER, M.A.,

OF

ROPSLEY, LINCOLNSHIRE,

IN ADMIRATION OF HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AS A LINGUIST,

AND AS A TESTIMONY OF PRIVATE REGARD,

the following pages are inscribed

BY HIS FRIEND,

THE AUTHOR.

London,
Nov. 4, 1841.

PREFACE.

In the present work are embodied those views of the Structure and Relations of the English Language, which, amongst such scholars as have studied them with the proper means and opportunities, are now generally received; and which, so being received, may take their stand as established and recognized facts. With the results of modern criticism, as applied to his native tongue, it is conceived that an educated Englishman should be familiar. To this extent the special details of the Language are exhibited; and to this extent the work is strictly a Grammar of the English Language.

But it is well known that the current Grammarians, and the critical Philologists, have long ceased to write alike upon the English, or indeed upon any other, Language. For this reason the sphere of the work becomes enlarged, so that, on many occasions, general Principles have to be enounced, fresh Terms to be defined, and old Classifications to be

remodelled. I know of no work upon the English Language, either written or contemplated, that does this. Had such been the case, the author of it should have found in myself, not a rival, but an expositor.

Secondary to the main object is an attempt to convey to the reader the chief Principles of General and Comparative Etymology. This secondary aim arises out of the subject-matter itself. If it be true that the Theory of a Language is best understood after the Practice of it has been acquired, the fittest disciplinal study in general Grammar, for the native of any country whatever, is the structure of his own Mother-tongue. It is, however, a prevalent opinion that the best vehicles for Grammatical instruction in the abstract, are the elements of foreign Languages; those of Greece and Rome having a conspicuous pre-eminence. Even if this position be true of the Languages themselves, it is not true of the Grammars wherein they are exhibited. For a practical, but superficial, insight into the logical characters of the Parts of Speech—for a useful, but loose, estimate of the powers of Moods, Tenses, Cases, and Numbers — for points of this sort I am not prepared to accuse the usual text-books in the Classical and other foreign Languages, of utter insufficiency. It may, indeed, be that they teach these matters well; although, for my own part, I doubt whether, unaccompanied by the habit of Composition, they teach them at all. Here, however, their utility ceases.

For the analogies that determine the form of words, for the forces that effect apparent Irregularities, and for the true mechanism of Etymological Inflection, they substitute arbitrary rules and accumulated exceptions. They teach only what it must afterwards cost an effort to unlearn. Let that Language exhibit the generalities of Grammar, wherein the study of the Theory is least traversed by that of the Practice. Let the Languages of Pericles and of Cæsar be sought after for their own transcendent merits. The methods that teach these most conveniently may be adhered to; but by no means should a Grammar, merely artificial, be mistaken for a groundwork in the Principles of Language.

To the acute Philology of Rask the frequent references indicate the extent of my obligations. To the comprehensive industry of Grimm they are still more numerous. Not to the Englishman alone, but to the German also; to the Hollander, to the Swede, and to the Icelander, to every author, in short, upon any one of the Gothic Languages, the Deutsche Grammatik is the great magazine, not merely of details, but of principles and suggestions as well. By the scholar in Icelandic and the scholar in Anglo-Saxon it is equally referred to. These circumstances may stand as measures of its value and importance, of its extent and erudition. However, as no work is exhaustive, it must not be thought that all has been done for the English Language, and that it has been done by a foreigner. I write

this in the knowledge that much still remains, whereof the greater part can be done by an Englishman at an advantage.

Two of these points, out of many, are the details of the Old English, and the bearings of the Provincial Dialects. In respect, too, to the Affinities of the Articulate sounds, the Germans have much to learn, and in respect to points of Metre they have much to unlearn. I have elsewhere recorded the anxious wish and firm hope, that the very foundation of accurate Etymology, the study of existing processes, should be begun by Englishmen, continued by Englishmen, and exhausted by Englishmen.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

HISTORICAL AND ANALYTICAL VIEW OF THE ENGLISH

CORRIGENDA.

Page 5, line 13, for "*twelfth*," read "*twentieth*."
Page 75, line 2, for "*Raskanthian*," read "*Rushworthian*."
Page 86, line 17, for "1363," read "*first half of the Fifteenth Century*."
Page 86, line 18, for "*the Bruce*," read "*Wallace*."

... same Stock . 7
Icelandic and A. S. compared . . . 7
Scandinavian Article . . . 8
Scandinavian Neuter Adjective . . . 11
Scandinavian Reflective Pronoun . . 11
Scandinavian Passive Voice . . . 12
5. Difference between Languages of the same Branch . 14
A. S. and M. G. compared 14
Strong and Weak Declensions . . 14
6. Difference between Languages of the same Division . . 19
A. S. and Old Frisian compared . . 19

CHAPTER II.

ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

7. The Celtic Stock 26
Cambrian Branch 26
Gaelic Branch 27
8. The Celtic Elements of English . . . 29

SECTION		PAGE
9.	Latin of the First Period	31
10.	Gothic Stock	31
	Scandinavian Branch	32
11.	Teutonic Branch	34
12.	High German Division	34
	Mœso-Gothic	34
13.	Old High German	35
14.	Middle High German	36
15.	Low German Division	37
	Frisian	38
16.	Platt-Deutsch	39
17.	Anglo-Saxon	40
18.	Direct Scandinavian Element of English	41
19.	Latin of Second Period	41
20.	French Element	42
21.	Provençal	43
22.	Norman-French	45
23.	Latin of Third Period	47
24.	Indirect Scandinavian Element of English	47
25.	Greek Elements	47
26.	Miscellaneous Elements	47
27.	A distinction	48
28.	Logical and Historical Analyses	49

CHAPTER III.

29.	Old Saxon	50
30.	Its Grammatical Structure	51
31.	Extract from Heliand	52

CHAPTER IV.

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH TO THE ANGLO-SAXON AND THE STAGES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

32.	Ancient and Modern Languages	55
33.	Comparison of English and A. S.	56
34.	Effects of Norman Conquest	60
35.	Semi-Saxon Stage	62
36.	Old English Stage	64
37.	Use of Anglo-Norman after the Conquest	66
38.	Middle English	67
39.	Present Tendencies of English	68
40.	Speculative question	68
41.	A Classical and a Gothic Element in English	69

CHAPTER V.

ON THE DIALECTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

SECTION		PAGE
42.	Two meanings of the word *Old*	70
43, 44.	Distribution of Dialects	71
45.	Danes in Scotland	74
46.	Miscellaneous notices of English Dialects	74
47.	Gypsy Dialect, Slang, Talkee-Talkee	81
48.	Anglo-Norman Extract	82

CHAPTER VI.

THE LOWLAND SCOTCH.

49.	Theories concerning the Lowland Scotch	84
50.	Specimens	86
51.	Points of difference between English and Lowland Scotch	89
52.	Instrument of Criticism	90

CHAPTER VII.

ON CERTAIN UNDETERMINED AND FICTITIOUS LANGUAGES OF GREAT BRITAIN.

53.	The Belgæ	91
54.	Picts	92
55.	Caledonians	93
56.	Iberians	94
57.	Supposed Affinities of the Irish	94
	Extract from Plautus	95
58.	Hypothesis of a Finnic Race	99

PART II.

SOUNDS, LETTERS, PRONUNCIATION, SPELLING.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL NATURE OF ARTICULATE SOUNDS.

59.	Preliminary Remarks	100
60.	Vowels and Consonants	102
61.	Divisions of Articulate Sounds	103
62.	Explanation of Terms	103
	Sharp and *Flat*	103
	Continuous and *Explosive*	104

SECTION PAGE
63. General Statements 104
64. *H* no articulation 104

CHAPTER II.

SYSTEM OF ARTICULATE SOUNDS.

65. System of Vowels 105
é fermé, ó *chiuso*, *ü* German . . . 105
66. System of Mutes 105
Lenes and Aspirates 106
Place of the Semivowels . . . 108
67. Affinities of the Liquids 108
68. Diphthongs 108
69. Compound Sibilants 109
70. *Ng* 110
71. Further explanation of Terms 110
Broad and *Slender* 110
Dependent and *Independent* . . . 110
72. System of Vowels 112
73. System of Mutes 112
74. Varieties 112
75. Connection in Phonetics 113
Grammar 113
Their coincidence 113

CHAPTER III.

ON CERTAIN COMBINATIONS OF ARTICULATE SOUNDS.

76. Unpronounceable Combinations . . . 114
77. Unstable Combinations 115
78. Effect of *y* 115
79. Evolution of New Sounds 116
80. Value of a sufficient System of Sounds . . 117
81. Double Consonants rare 117
82. True Aspirates rare 118

CHAPTER IV.

EUPHONY; THE PERMUTATION AND TRANSITION OF LETTERS.

83. Euphonic change exhibited 120
84. The *rationale* of it 120
85. The Combinations *-mt*, *-nt* 121
86. The Combinations *-pth* 121
Accommodation 122

SECTION PAGE
87. Accommodation of Vowels . . . 122
88. Permutation of Letters . . . 122
89. Transition of Letters 124

CHAPTER V.

ON THE FORMATION OF SYLLABLES.

90. Distribution of Consonants between two Syllables . 125

CHAPTER VI.

ON QUANTITY.

91. *Long* and *Short* 128
92. How far coincident with *Independent* and *Dependent* . 128
93. Length of Vowels and Length of Syllables . . 129
Importance of the Distinction . . . 130

CHAPTER VII.

ON ACCENT.

94. Accent 132
95. How far Accent always on the root . . . 133
96. Verbal Accent and Logical Accent . . 134
Extract from Nares 134
97. Effect of Accent on Orthography . . . 135
98. Accent and Quantity *not* the same . . . 136
Extract from Guest's English Rhythms . 137

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ORTHOEPY.

99. Meaning of the word *Orthoepy* . . . 138
101. Classification of Errors in Pronunciation . . 138
according to their situation . . 138
102. according to their cause . . 140
103. Causes of Erroneous Enunciation . . . 140
104. Appreciation of Standards of Orthoepy . . 142
105. Principles of Critical Orthoepy . . . 143

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF ORTHOGRAPHY.

106. Province of Orthography 145
107. Imperfections of Alphabets . . . 145
108. Application of Alphabets 147

SECTION PAGE
109. Changes of Sound, and original false Spelling . 148
110. Theory of a Perfect Alphabet . . . 149
111. Sounds and Letters in English . . . 149
Imperfection of the English Orthography . . 152
112. Certain conventional modes of Spelling . . 156
113. The inconvenience of them 158
114. Criticism upon the details of the English Orthography 158

CHAPTER X.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ENGLISH ALPHABET.

115. Bearings of the question 171
116. Phœnician Period 171
117. Greek Period 172
118. Latin Period 174
119. The Mœso-Gothic Alphabet 177
120. The A. S. Alphabet 177
Extract from Otfrid 179
121. Anglo-Norman Period 179
122. On the doubled Consonant 181
Extract from the Ormulum . . . 181
123. Notice of the *Runes* 182
124. The Order of the Alphabet . . . 183
125. Parallel and Equivalent Orthographies . . . 186

PART III.

ETYMOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE PROVINCE OF ETYMOLOGY.

126. Meaning of Etymology 188
Grammatical Etymology 189
Comparative Etymology 189
127. Grimm's Law 190

CHAPTER II.

ON GENDER.

128. Words like *boy, girl* 195
129. *man-servant, maid-servant* . . . 195

SECTION PAGE
130. Words like *lion, lioness* 196
131. Element of true Gender 196
132. Second Element of true Gender 197
133. How far true Gender in English 198
134. *The sun in* his *glory* 198
Extract from Cobbett 199
135. Miscellaneous remarks 200
Forms in *-ster* 201
Form *Gander* 202
Drake 203
Peacock 203

CHAPTER III.

THE NUMBERS.

136. In some Languages *three* 204
137. How many in English 204
138. The extent of the Numbers in English . . 204
139. Formation of the Numbers 206
Forms like *Boxes*, &c. 207
Loaves, &c. 208
Pence, &c. 208
Mathematics, &c. . . . 209
140. The Form in *-r* 211
141. The Forms in *-en* 211
142. Forms like *feet* 211

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE CASES.

143. Nature of Cases 213
Change of Form necessary 215
Accidental identity of Form . . . 216
144. Cases in English 217
145. Origin of Cases 217
Tests in determining Cases 218
Remote origin of Cases 219
146. Analysis of Cases 219
147. True Nature of the Genitive in *'s* . . 220

CHAPTER V.

THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

SECTION		PAGE
148.	Their number defined	221
	Their Declension	223
149.	Forms in *-n* and *-r*	223
150.	Possible Etymological relation of *me* and *we*	223

CHAPTER VI.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

151.	Distinguished from the Personal	225
	Their Declension	227
152.	Relative and Interrogative	229
153.	Sounds characteristic of the Demonstratives	229
154.	Miscellaneous Notices	230
	Derived Pronouns	231
	Compound Pronouns	231
	Other, whether	233

CHAPTER VII.

THE COMPARATIVE DEGREE.

155.	Degrees of Comparison	235
156.	Gothic Form in *-s*	236
	Comparison of Adverbs	236
157.	Change of Vowel	237
158.	Excess of Expression	238
	Sequences in Logic and in Etymology	238
	The Form *worse*	239
	much	240
	less, &c.	241
159.	Other Forms in *-er*	242

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE SUPERLATIVE DEGREE.

160.	Superlative Degree	244
161.	How far derived from the Comparative	244
162.	Signs in Indo-European	245
	Forms in *-most*	246
163.	Other Forms in *-st*	247

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE ORDINAL NUMBERS.

SECTION		PAGE
164.	*First*	248
165.	*Second*	248
166.	*Third, fourth*, &c.	249
	Affinity of Ideas	249
	Proofs	249
	Ordinals, how far Superlative?	250
167.	Theory of *seven, nine, ten*	251

CHAPTER X.

THE ARTICLES.

168.	Definite and Indefinite	252

CHAPTER XI.

DIMINUTIVES, AUGMENTATIVES, PATRONYMICS.

169.	Classification of Diminutives	255
170.	Augmentatives	258
171.	Patronymics	258
	Forms in *-l-ing*	259

CHAPTER XII.

ON VERBS IN GENERAL.

172.	Derived and Underived	261
	Forms in *-en*	261
	like *fell*	261
	survéy	262
	prize	263

CHAPTER XIII.

ON THE PERSONS.

173.	Comparison with other Languages	264
174.	Original Forms of the Personal endings	266
	Causes of present Forms	267
	callest	268
175.	Forms like *wert*	269
176.	*spakest, sangest*	270

CHAPTER XIV.

ON THE NUMBERS OF VERBS.

SECTION PAGE
177. Forms like *sang*, *sung*, &c. 271

CHAPTER XV.

ON MOODS.

178. The Form *were* 273

CHAPTER XVI.

ON TENSES.

179. General Nature of Tenses 274
180. Perfects and Aorists replacing each other . . 275
181. M. G. Perfects 276
182. The Terms *Strong* and *Weak* 277

CHAPTER XVII.

THE STRONG TENSES.

183. Form of the *Strong* Tenses 278
184. Forms *sang* and *sungon* in A.S. 278
185—197. Classes of Strong Verbs . . 279—289

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE WEAK TENSES.

198. Formation of the Weak Tenses 290
199. First Class 291
200. Second Class 291
201. Third Class 292
202. Forms like *sent*, *bled*, *cost*, &c. . . . 293
203. *Made*, *had*, &c. &c. 295
Aught, *durst* 296
Must 297
Wist 298
Do 299
Mind 300
Yode 301
204. Origin of Form in *d* 301

CHAPTER XIX.

ON CONJUGATION.

SECTION		PAGE
205.	The Conjugations in M. G.	303
206.	Coincidence of Conjugations, how far?	304
207.	Weak Forms once Strong	307
208.	Strong Division *natural*	309
209.	Obsolete Forms	309
210.	Double Forms	310

CHAPTER XX.

DEFECTIVENESS AND IRREGULARITY.

211.	Criticism as to the use of the term *Irregular*	311
212.	*Could*	316
213.	*Quoth*	317

CHAPTER XXI.

THE IMPERSONAL VERBS.

214.	*Meseems*	319
215.	*Methinks*	319
216.	*Me lists*	319

CHAPTER XXII.

THE VERB SUBSTANTIVE.

217.	The Verb Substantive not Irregular	320
218.	*Was*	320
219.	*Be*	321
220.	Future Power of *beó* in A. S.	321
221.	*Am*	322

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

222.	The Form in *-ing*	323

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE PAST PARTICIPLE.

223.	The Form in *-en*	325
224.	Forms like *found*, &c.	325
225.	*Drank, drunk, drunken*, &c.	325
226.	*Mow, mowed, mown*, &c.	326
227.	*Forlorn, frore*	326
228.	The Form in *-d* or *-t*	327
229.	Forms like *yclept*	327

CHAPTER XXV.

ON COMPOSITION.

SECTION		PAGE
230.	Nature of Compound Words	328
231.	The two Parts or Elements	330
232, 233.	Definition of Composition	331
234.	Importance of Accent	332
	Compound Ideas and Compound Forms	334
	Effect of Metre	335
235.	Composition taking the appearance of Derivation	336
236.	Words like *monkshood, well-head*, &c.	337
	upstanding	338
	perhaps	338
237.	Words like *peacock*	339
238.	Obsolete Words in Combination	340
239.	Words like *sparrow-grass*	341

CHAPTER XXVI.

ON DERIVATION AND INFLECTION.

240.	Meanings of the words	342
241.	Classification of Derived Words	343
242.	Words like *súrvey, survéy*, &c.	344
243.	Words like *churl, blind*, &c.	345
244.	Words like *tip* and *top*, &c. &c.	345
245.	The word *ease*	346
246.	Derivation simulating Composition	346

CHAPTER XXVII.

ON HYBRIDISM AND THE INTRODUCTION OF NEW WORDS.

247.	Meaning of the word	347
248.	Specimens of Hybridism	347
249.	*Witticism, Tobacconist*	348
250.	Rule for Foreign Derived Words	349
251.	The word *Icicle*	349
252.	Incompletion of the Radical	349

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ADVERBS AND UNINFLECTED PARTS OF SPEECH.

253.	Classification of Adverbs	350
254.	Adverbs of Deflection	351
255.	Words like *darkling*, &c.	352

SECTION PAGE
256. Adverbs in *-ly* 353
257. Prepositions 353
258. Conjunctions 354
259. Affirmatives and Negatives 354
260. Particles 355

PART IV.

SYNTAX.

261. Province of Syntax 356
262. Divisions in Syntax 357
263. Syntax modified by the extent of Inflection . . 358
264. Apparent specimens of bad Syntax explicable . . 358
265. Apposition 358
266. Collectiveness 359
267. Personification 359
268. Ellipsis 360
269. Pleonasm 360
I do speak, not Pleonastic . . . 360
270. Zeugma 361
271. Πρὸς το σημαινόμενον 361
272. Reduction of Complex Forms . . . 361
273. True notion of Part of Speech employed . . 361
274. Concord of Gender 362
275. Concord of Number 362
276. *It is they* 362
277. *There is men* 363
278. *Either* and *neither* 363
279. *Alms*, *news*, &c. &c. 364
280. Concord of Person 365
281. *Methinks*, &c. 365
282. *Myself am weak* 365
283. Concord of Cases 365
284. Government 365
By rights 366
285. *Give it him* 366
286. *Than* 366
287. *I have spoken* 366
288. Collocation 367
289. Power of the form in *'s* 368
Preposition *of* 368
290. Case Absolute 368
291. *All the more* 369

SECTION PAGE
292. *He walked the horse* 369
293. Present for Future 369
294. *Is gifen* in A. S. 369
295. Future power of *be* in A. S. . . . 369
296. *A* and *an* before *u* 370

PART V.

ON THE PROSODY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

297. Metre 371
298. Classical Metres measured by Quantities . . 372
299. English Metres measured by Accents . . 372
300. Alliterative Metres 372
301. Rhyme 373
Assonances 374
302. Definition of Rhyme 375
303. Measures 376
304. Dissyllabic and Trisyllabic . . . 376
305. Dissyllabic Measures 376
306. Trisyllabic Measures 377
307. Measures different from Feet . . . 377
308. Couplets, Stanzas, &c. &c. . . . 380
309. Names of Elementary Metres . . . 380
Octosyllabics 380
Heroics 380
Alexandrines 380
Service Metre 380
310. Metres in Combination 381
Heroic Couplets 381
Heroic Triplets 381
Blank Verse 381
Elegiacs 381
Rhyme Royal 381
Ottava Rima 381
Spenserian Stanza 382
Terza Rima 382
Poulterer's Measure 382
Ballad Metre 382
311. Scansion 382
312. Symmetrical Metres 383
313. Unsymmetrical Metres 383
314. Measure of *one* and of *four* Syllables rare . . 384

ABBREVIATIONS.

A. S. = Anglo-Saxon.
O. S. = Old Saxon.
O. E. = Old English.
O. Fr. = Old Frisian.
M. G. = Mœso-Gothic.
O. H. G. = Old High German.
M. H. G. = Middle High German.
N. H. G. = New High German.
I. = Icelandic.
O. N. = Old Norse.
D. = Danish.
S. = Swedish.
Fr. = French.
A. N. = Anglo-Norman.
Prov. = Provincial Dialects.
D. G. = Grimm's German Grammar (*Deutsche Grammatik*).
Rask. = Rask's Anglo-Saxon Grammar (*Thorpe's Translation*).

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE STUDY OF

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

PART I.

HISTORICAL AND ANALYTICAL VIEW OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL ETHNOGRAPHICAL RELATIONS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 1. LANGUAGES that differ from each other, as the Greek differs from the Icelandic, the Anglo-Saxon from the Latin, or the Welsh from the Russian, differ as languages of the same *tribe*, but of different *stocks*. The Greek, Saxon, and Welsh belong, respectively, to the Classical, the Gothic, and the Celtic *stocks* of the Indo-European *tribe* of languages.

Languages that differ as the Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon, the Latin and Greek, the Welsh and Irish, differ as languages of the same *stock*, but of different *branches*. The Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon belong respectively to the Scandinavian and Teutonic branches of the Gothic stock;

the Latin and Greek to the Italian and Hellenic branches of the Classical stock; the Welsh and Irish to the Cambrian and Gaelic branches of the Celtic stock.

Languages that differ as the Anglo-Saxon and Mœso-Gothic differ as languages of the same *branch*, but of different *divisions*. The Anglo-Saxon, Frisian, English, and Dutch are languages of the *Low* Germanic division of the Teutonic branch of the Gothic stock; whereas the Modern *High* German and Mœso-Gothic belong to its *High* Germanic division.

Languages of the same division, but differing from each other as the English differs from the Dutch of Holland, differ as *languages, the word being used in a restricted and a technical sense, and opposed to the term dialect.*

Modes of speech differing from each other as the provincialisms of Durham differ from the provincialisms of Somerset, are different *dialects* of the same language.

§ 2. *Indo-European.* — Such is the name given to the tribe whereto all the stocks of which mention has hitherto been made belong. The area over which this tribe is spread extends from India to Ireland.

When Comparative Philology first found the attention that it deserved, an affinity was discovered between the German and the Persian languages; and, afterwards, a closer one between the ancient language of India (the Sanskrit) and the Greek.

That the Celtic languages were Indo-European has lately been demonstrated by Dr. Pritchard, in his work entitled "The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations."

Besides the languages already mentioned,

The Zend, or Old Persian, and the Pehlehvi, or Middle Persian, are Indo-European.

The Armenian is Indo-European.

The Ossetic, a language spoken by an insulated tribe of

Mount Caucasus, and a supposed remnant of the Ancient Median, is Indo-European.

The languages OF Poland, Bohemia, Servia, &c. &c., constituting the Slavonic stock, are Indo-European.

The Livonian (or Lettish) of Livonia and of Courland, the Old Prussian, and the Lithuanian of Lithuania, constituting the Lithuanic stock, are Indo-European.

The stocks then that constitute the Indo-European tribe are (counting from East to West) as follows:

1. The Gentoo, or Sanskrit stock, containing all the dialects of Hindostan, that are derived from the Sanskrit, but not containing the Tamul language, which belongs to another *tribe*.

2. The Iranian stock, so called from the native name of Persia (Iran), containing the ancient, middle, and modern Persian, with the allied tongues (languages or dialects) of Curdistan, Affgaunistan, Beloochistan, and Bocharia. It cannot be too strongly stated that the language of the Affgauns is Persian, and not Hebrew, as the great authority of Sir William Jones has led some to suppose.

3. The Armenian stock, containing the single language of Armenia; the neighbouring language of Georgia belonging to a different tribe.

4. The Ossetic stock, containing a single language; possibly this is no true stock, but only a branch of the Iranian.

5. The Classical, by some called the Pelasgic, by some the Thracian, and by some the Phrygian stock. This comprises the Greek of the ancients, and the Romaic of the present time. It comprises also the Latin of the Romans, and all the languages derived from it; amongst others, the French, the Italian, the Spanish, and the Portuguese. This stock falls into two branches, 1st. the

Hellenic or Greek branch, 2nd. the Ausonian, Italian, or Latin branch.

6. The Slavonic stock.

7. The Lithuanic stock.

8. The Gothic stock: the branches and divisions of which will be exhibited in the next Chapter.

9. The Celtic stock. For this, see Chapter II.

Of all the other European languages (with the exception, perhaps, of the Albanian) we may safely assert that they are *not* Indo-European. In this negative character the Basque, the Turkish, the Maltese, the Calmuck of the Crimea, the Magyaric, or Hungarian, the Esthonian, the Finlandic, and the Lapponic all agree.

§ 3. Between languages of different stocks, as the Greek and English, the Welsh and Latin, the Saxon and Sanskrit, &c. &c., there is no occasion to display the *difference*. This lies on the surface, and is seen at once. The *affinity* is the point that wants exhibiting. This is shown best, sometimes in the grammatical structure, and sometimes in the comparison of isolated words. In the present section, the Ordinal Numerals, the Pronouns of the two first Persons, and the Forms of the Persons of the Verbs, are chosen as specimens of the nature of that etymological likeness which collects the Gentoo, the Iranian, the Classical, the Gothic, the Lithuanic, and the Slavonic stocks into one and the same tribe, *viz.* the Indo-European.

THE ORDINAL NUMBERS.

Sanskrit.	*Zend.*	*Greek.*	*Latin.*	*Mæso-Gothic.*	*Lith.*	*Slavonic.*	*English.*
Pra'tamâ	fratĕma	πρώτα .	prima	fruma	pirmà	pervaja	*first.*
Dvitîyâ	bitya	δευτέρα	altera	anthara	antrà	vtoraja	*second.*
Tritîya	thritya	τρίτα	tertia	thridjô	tré'cià	tretija	*third.*
'Catur'tâ	tûirya	τετάρτα	quarta	(fidvôrdô)	ketwirtà	c'etvertaja	*fourth.*
Pan'camâ	pugdha	πέμπτα	quinta	fimftô	penktà	pjataja	*fifth.*
'Sa's'ṭa	cstvâ	ἕκτα	sexta	saihsto	szésta	'sestaja	*sixth.*
Saptamâ	haptatha	ἑβδόμα	septima	(sibundô)	sékma	sedmaja	*seventh.*
A'ṣṭamâ	astĕma	ὀγδόα	octava	ahtudô	ászma	osmaja	*eighth.*
Navamâ	nâuma	ἐννάτα	nona	niundô	dewintà	devjataja	*ninth.*
Da'samâ	da'sĕma	δεκάτα	decima	taihundô	deszimtà	desjataja	*tenth.*
'Ekâda'sâ	aêvande'sa	ἑνδεκάτα	undecima	(ainliftô)	wienólikta	—	*eleventh.*
Vinsatitama	vîs'aititĕma·	εἰκοστά	vicesima	—	dwideszimta	—	*twelfth.*

In the work from whence the whole of these words has been taken (viz. Bopp's *Vergleichende Grammatik*) it was thought right to give them in the Feminine Gender, and, as far as the Greek is concerned, in the Doric Dialect.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

Sanskrit.	*Zend.*	*Greek.*	*Latin.*	*Mæso-Gothic.*	*Lithuanic.*	*Slavonic.*	*English.*
Aham	azĕm	ἐγών	ego	ik	asz	az	*I.*
Mâm	manm	μέ	me	mik	manen	mja	*me.*
Tvam	tûm	τούν	tu	þu.	tù	ty	*thou.*
Tvâm	thwanm	τε	te	þuk	tawen	tja	*thee.*

PERSONS OF THE VERB.

	Sanskrit.	*Zend.*	*Greek.*	*Latin.*	*Gothic.*	*Lithuanic.*	*Slavonic.*	*English.*
1st Sing.	tiˊsˊṭâmi	histâmi	ἵστημι	sto	*stam	stowmi	stoju	*I stand.*
	dadâmi	dadhâmi	δίδωμι	do	—	dȯumi	damj	*I give.*
	asmi	ahmi	ἐ'ιμί	sum	im	esmi	jesmj	*I am.*
1st Plur.	tiˊsˊṭâmas	—	ἵσταμεν	stamus	*stames	stowimè	stoim	*we stand.*
	dadmas	—	δίδομεν	damus	—	dȯudame	damy	*we give.*
2nd Sing.	tiˊsˊṭasi	histahi	ἵστης	stas	*stas	stowi	stoïˊsi	*thou standest.*
	dadâsi	dadhâhi	δίδως	das	—	dȯudi	dasi	*thou givest.*
	asi	ahi	ἔσσι	es	is	essi	jesi	*thou art.*
2nd Plur.	tiˊsˊṭaˊta	histatha	ἵστατε	statis	*stat	—	—	*ye stand.*
3rd Sing.	tiˊstati	hìstati	ἵστατι	stat	*stat	stow	stoitj	*he standeth.*
	dadâti	dadhati	δίδω	dat	—	dȯusti	dastj	*he giveth.*
	asti	a'sti	ἐστι	est	ist	esti	jestj	*he is.*
3rd Plur.	tiˊsˊṭanti	histĕnti	ἵστασι	stant	*stant	—	stojatj	*they stand.*
	dadati	dadĕnti	δίδοντι	dant	—	—	dadjatj	*they give.*
	santi	hĕnti	ἔασι	sunt	sind	—	sûtj	*they are.*

The words in the fifth column that are marked with an asterisk, are quoted not from the Mœso-Gothic, but from the Old High German.

§ 4. With languages of the same *stock*, it is necessary to exhibit the difference rather than the likeness. In the following pages the inflections of the Icelandic, of the Scandinavian branch, is compared with those of the Anglo-Saxon, of the Teutonic branch of the Gothic stock.

Declension of Substantives ending with a *Vowel.*

		Saxon.	*Icelandic.*
		Neuter.	*Neuter.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Eáge (*an Eye*)	Auga (*an Eye*).
	Acc.	Eáge	Auga.
	Dat.	Eágan	Auga.
	Gen.	Eágan	Auga.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Eágan	Augu.
	Acc.	Eágan	Augu.
	Dat.	Eágan	Augum.
	Gen.	Eágan	Augna.
		Masculine.	*Masculine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Nama (*a Name*)	Bogi (*a Bow*).
	Acc.	Naman	Boga.
	Dat.	Naman	Boga.
	Gen.	Naman	Boga.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Naman	Bogar.
	Acc.	Naman	Boga.
	Dat.	Namum	Bogum.
	Gen.	Namena	Boga.
		Feminine.	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Tunge (*a Tongue*)	Tunga (*a Tongue*).
	Acc.	Tungan	Tungu.
	Dat.	Tungan	Tungu.
	Gen.	Tungan	Tungu.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Tungan	Tungur.
	Acc.	Tungan	Tungur.
	Dat.	Tungum	Tungum.
	Gen.	Tungena	Tungna.

Declension of Substantives ending with a *Consonant.*

		Saxon.	*Icelandic.*
		Neuter.	*Neuter.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Leáf (*a Leaf*)	Skip (*a Ship*).
	Acc.	Leáf	Skip.
	Dat.	Leáfe	Skipi.
	Gen.	Leáfes	Skips.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Leáf	Skip.
	Acc.	Leáf	Skip.
	Dat.	Leáfum	Skipum.
	Gen.	Leáfa	Skipa.
		Masculine.	*Masculine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Smiđ (*a Smith*)	Konungr (*a King*).
	Acc.	Smiđ	Konung.
	Dat.	Smiđe	Konungi.
	Gen.	Smiđes	Konungs.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Smiđas	Konungar.
	Acc.	Smiđas	Konunga.
	Dat.	Smiđum	Konungum.
	Gen.	Smiđa	Konunga.
		Feminine.	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Spr'æc (*a Speech*)	Brúđr (*a Bride*).
	Acc.	Spr'æce	Brúđi.
	Dat.	Spr'æce	Brúđi.
	Gen.	Spr'æce	Brúđar.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Spr'æca	Brúđir.
	Acc.	Spr'æca	Brúđir.
	Dat.	Spr'ækum	Brúđum.
	Gen.	Spr'æca	Brúđa.

The most characteristic difference between the Saxon and Icelandic lies in the peculiar position of the Definite Article in the latter language. In Saxon, the Article corresponding with the modern word *The*, is *þæt, Se, Seó*, for the Neuter, Masculine, and Feminine Genders respectively; and these words, regularly declined, are *prefixed* to the words with which they agree, just as is the case with the English and with the majority of languages. In Icelandic, however, the Article, instead of preceding, *follows*

its Noun, with which it coalesces, having previously suffered a change in form. The Icelandic Article corresponding to *þæt, Se, Seó,* is *Hitt* (N.), *Hinn* (M.), *Hin* (F.): from this the *h* is ejected, so that instead of the regular inflection (*a*), we have in composition the forms (*b*).

a.

		Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Hitt	Hinn	Hin.
	Acc.	Hitt	Hinn	Hina.
	Dat.	Hinu	Hinum	Hinni.
	Gen.	Hins	Hins	Hinnar.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Hin	Hinir	Hinar.
	Acc.	Hin	Hina	Hinar.
	Dat.	Hinum	Hinum	Hinum.
	Gen.	Hinna	Hinna	Hinna.

b.

Sing.	*Nom.*	—it	—inn	—in.
	Acc.	—it	—inn	—ina (-na).
	Dat.	—nu	—num	—inni (-nni).
	Gen.	—ins	—ins	—innar (-nnar).
Plur.	*Nom.*	—in	—nir	—nar.
	Gen.	—in	—na	—nar.
	Dat.	—num	—num	—num.
	Acc.	—nna	—nna	—nna.

whence, in composition,

		Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Augat	Boginn	Túngan.
	Acc.	Augat	Boginn	Túnguna.
	Dat.	Auganu	Boganum	Túngunni.
	Gen.	Augans	Bogans	Túngunnar.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Augun	Bogarnir	Túngurnar.
	Acc.	Augun	Bogana	Túngurnar.
	Dat.	Augunum	Bogunum	Túngunum.
	Gen.	Augnanna	Boganna	Túngnanna.

In the Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish, this peculiarity in the position of the Definite Article is preserved. Its origin, however, is concealed; and an accidental identity with the Indefinite Article has led to false notions respect-

ing its nature. In the languages in point the *i* is changed into *e*, so that what in Icelandic is *it* and *in*, is in Danish *et* and *en*. *En*, however, as a separate word, is the numeral *One*, and also the Indefinite Article *a*. In the Neuter Gender it is *et*. En Sol, *a sun;* et Bord, *a table;* Solen, *the sun;* Bordet, *the table.* From modern forms like those just quoted, it has been imagined that the Definite Article is merely the Indefinite one transposed.

Reference will be made to this passage on more occasions than one, to show how words originally distinct may, in the process of time, take the appearance of being identical. To apply an expression of Mr. Cobbett's, the *En = a*, and *En = The*, are *the same combination of letters, but not the same word.*

DECLENSION OF ADJECTIVES.

Saxon.

Definite.

Singular.

	Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Nom.	Góde	Goda	Góde.
Acc.	Góde	Gódan	Gódan.
Abl.	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan.
Dat.	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan.
Gen.	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan.

Plural.

Nom.	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan.
Acc.	Gódan	Gódan	Gódan.
Abl.	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum.
Dat.	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum.
Gen.	Godena	Godena.	Godena.

Indefinite.

Singular.

	Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Nom.	Gód	Gód	Gód.
Acc.	Gód	Gódne	Góde.
Abl.	Góde	Góde	Gódre.
Dat.	Gódum	Gódum	Gódre.
Gen.	Gódes	Gódes	Gódre.

Icelandic.

Definite.

Singular.

	Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Nom.	Haga	Hagi	Haga
Acc.	Haga	Haga	Högu.
Abl.	Haga	Haga	Högu.
Dat.	Haga	Haga	Högu.
Gen.	Haga	Haga	Högu.

Högu is the Plural form for all the Cases and all the Genders.

Indefinite.

Singular.

	Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Nom.	Hagt	Hagr	Hög.
Acc.	Hagt	Hagan	Hög.
Abl.	Högu	Högum	Hagri.
Dat.	Högu	Högum	Hagri.
Gen.	Hags	Hags	Hagrar.

	Saxon. *Indefinite.* *Plural.*			*Icelandic.* *Indefinite.* *Plural.*		
	Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*	*Neut.*	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Nom.	Góde	Góde	Góde.	Hög	Hagir	Hagar.
Acc.	Góde	Góde	Góde.	Hög	Haga	Hagar.
Abl.	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum.	Högum	Högum	Högum.
Dat.	Gódum	Gódum	Gódum.	Högum	Högum	Högum.
Gen.	Gódra	Gódra	Gódra.	Hagra	Hagra	Hagra.

Observe in the Icelandic forms the absence of the termination *an.* Observe also the Neuter termination *t*, as *Hagr Hagt.* In the modern forms of the Icelandic (*viz.* the Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian languages) this termination is still preserved, e. g.: *En gode Hest*, a good horse; *Et godt Hjært*, a good heart; *En skön Pige*, a beautiful damsel; *Et skarpt Svœrd*, a sharp sword.

Amongst the Pronouns the following differences present themselves. The Saxon forms are, for the Pronoun of the Second Person, *þu* (thou), *Git* (ye *two*), *Ge* (ye); whilst in Icelandic they are *þu*, *þið*, *þer*, respectively. Again, in Saxon the reflective Pronoun corresponding with the Latin *se*, is rare. In Icelandic we have *Sik*, *Sér*, *Sin*, corresponding to the Latin *se*, *sibi*, *suus*. Besides this, the word *Sin* is declined, so that like the Latin *Suus* it becomes adjectival.

Sing.	*Nom.*	Sitt	Sinn	Sín.
	Acc.	Sitt	Sinn	Sína.
	Dat.	Sinu	Sínum	Sinni.
	Gen.	Sins	Síns	Sinnar.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Sín	Sínir	Sínar.
	Acc.	Sín	Sína	Sínar.
	Dat.	Sínum	Sínum	Sínum.
	Gen.	Sinna	Sinna	Sinna.

In Saxon there is no such an adjectival form. *There* the Possessives of the Third Person correspond not with

the Latin *Suus, Sua, Suum;* but with the Latin *ejus* and *eorum.* The English words *His* and *Her* are *Genitive* cases, not *Adjectives.*

Further remarks upon the presence of the Reflective Pronoun *Sik,* in Icelandic, and its absence in Saxon, will appear in the sequel.

THE NUMERALS.

Saxon.	*Icelandic.*
1. 'An	Eitt, einn, ein.
2. Twá	Tvö, tveir.
3. þreó	þrju, þrir.
4. Feower	Fjögur, fjórir.
5. Fíf	Fimm.
6. Six	Sex.
7. Seofon	Sjö.
8. Eahta	'Atta.
9. Nigon	Niu.
10. Tyn	Tiu.

Of the Icelandic Verbs the Infinitives end in *a;* as *Kalla,* to call; *Elska,* to love; whereas the Saxon termination is *an;* as *Lufian,* to love, *Wyrcan,* to work.

The Persons are as follows:

	Saxon.	*Icelandic.*
Pres. Sing.	1. Bærne	Brenni.
	2. Bærnst	Brennir.
	3. Bærnð	Brennir.
Plur.	1. Bærnað	Brennum.
	2. Bærnað	Brennið.
	3. Bærnað	Brenna.

The characteristic, however, of the Icelandic (indeed, of all the Scandinavian languages) is the possession of a Passive Form, or a Passive Voice, ending in *st—Ek, þu, Hann, Brennist, I, Thou, He, is burnt; Ver brennumst, We are burnt; þér brennizt, Ye are burnt; þeir brennast, They are burnt.* Past Tense, *Ek, þu, Hann brendist; Ver brendumst, þér brenduzt, þeir brendust.* Imperat. *Brenstu, Be thou burnt.* Infinit. *Brennast, to be burnt.*

In the modern Scandinavian languages the Passive is still preserved, but without the final *t*. In Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian the form is, Active, *Elske* (D. and N.), *Elska* (S.); Passive, *Elskes* (D. and N.), *Elskas* (S.); and in these languages the sense is invariably Passive, not *Middle*. In the *older* stages of Icelandic, on the other hand, the termination is not *st* but *sc:* which *sc* grew out of the reflective Pronoun *Sik*. With these phenomena the Scandinavian languages give us the evolution and development of a Passive Voice: wherein we have the following series of changes; 1st. the Reflective Pronoun coalesces with the Verb, whilst the sense changes from that of a Reflective to that of a Middle Verb; 2nd. the *c* changes to *t*, whilst the Middle sense passes into a Passive one; 3rd. *t* is dropped from the end of the word, and the expression that was once Reflective then becomes strictly Passive.

Now the Saxons have no Passive Voice at all. That they should have one *originating* like that of the Scandinavians was impossible. Having no reflective Pronoun, they had nothing to evolve it from.

The Auxiliary Verb.

		Saxon.	*Icelandic.*
		Indicative. Present.	
Sing.	1.	Eom (*I am*)	Em.
	2.	Eart	Ert.
	3.	Is	Er.
Plur.	1.	Synd (Syndon)	Erum.
	2.	Synd (Syndon)	Eruð.
	3.	Synd (Syndon)	Eru.
		Indicative. Past.	
Sing.	1.	Wæ's	Var.
	2.	Wæ're	Vart.
	3.	Wæ's	Var.
Plur.	1.	Wæ'ron	Vorum.
	2.	Wæ'ron	Voruð.
	3.	Wæ'ron	Voru.

		Saxon.	*Icelandic.*
		Subjunctive. Present.	
Sing.	1.	Sy′	Sé.
	2.	Sy′	Sér.
	3.	Sy′	Sé.
Plur.	1.	Sy′n	Séum.
	2.	Sy′n	Seuð.
	3.	Sy′n	Séu.
		Subjunctive. Past.	
Sing.	1.	Wæ′re	Væri.
	2.	Wæ′re	Værir.
	3.	Wæ′re	Væri.
Plur.	1.	Wæ′ron	Værum.
	2.	Wæ′ron	Væruð.
	3.	Wæ′ron	Væru.
		Infinitive.	
		Wesan	Vera.
		Participle.	
		Wesende	Verandi.

Recapitulating, we find that the characteristic differences of the greatest importance between the Icelandic and Saxon are three in number.

1st. The peculiar nature of the Definite Article.

2nd. The Neuter form of the Adjectives in *-t.*

3rd. The existence of a Passive Voice in *s.* These (as prominent points of language) are found in *all* the Scandinavian languages, and in *none* of the Teutonic ones.

§ 5. In comparing the A. S. with the Icelandic, the Substantives were divided as follows: 1st, into those ending with a Vowel; 2ndly, into those ending with a Consonant. (*See p.* 7.) In respect to the Substantives ending with a Vowel, (*Eáge, Nama, Tunge,*) it may have been observed that their cases were in A. S. almost exclusively formed in

-n, as *Eágan*, *Tungan*, &c. &c.; whilst words like *Skip* and *Smiδ* had, throughout their whole declension, no case formed in *-n*, no case indeed wherein the sound of *-n* entered. This enables us (at least with the A. S.) to make a general assertion concerning the Substantives ending in a *Vowel* in contrast to those ending in a *Consonant*, viz. that they take an inflection in *-n*.

In Icelandic this inflection in *-n* is but little developed. Fragments, however, or rudiments of it, are found in the Genitive Plurals of the Neuter and Feminine Genders, as *Augna*, *Tungna;* so that in Icelandic also we may make the same general assertion that we make in A. S., *viz.* that Substantives ending in a Vowel take (to a degree) an inflection in *-n*

In the Mœso-Gothic, however, we are unable to make the division that was made in A. S. *viz.* the division of the Substantives into those ending in a Vowel and into those ending in a Consonant. Instead of this the Mœso-Gothic Substantives are classed according to the presence or the absence of the letter *n* in their inflection. Nouns of which no case ends in *-n* are called *Strong*. Nouns of which one (or more cases) is formed in *-n* are called *Weak*. Declension for declension the Strong Substantives in Mœso-Gothic coincide with those that in A. S. and Icelandic end in a Consonant; the Weak with those that end in a Vowel.

Declension of Weak Substantives in Mœso-Gothic.

Neuter.

	Singular.	*Plural.*
Nom.	'Augô (*an Eye*)	'Augôna.
Acc.	'Augô	'Augôna.
Dat.	'Augin	'Augam.
Gen.	'Augins	'Augônê.

Masculine.

Singular.		*Plural.*
Nom.	Manna (*a Man*)	Mannans.
Acc.	Mannan	Mannans.
Dat.	Mannin	Mannam.
Gen.	Mannins	Mannanê.

Feminine.

Nom.	Tuggô (*a Tongue*)	Tuggôns.
Acc.	Tuggôn	Tuggôns.
Dat.	Tuggôn	Tuggôm.
Gen.	Tuggôns	Tuggônô.

Declension of Strong Substantives in Mœso-Gothic.

Neuter.

Singular.		*Plural.*
Nom.	Vaúrd (*a Word*)	Vaúrda.
Acc.	Vaúrd	Vaúrda.
Dat.	Vaúrda	Vaúrdam.
Gen.	Vaúrdis	Vaúrdê.

Masculine.

Nom.	Fisks (*a Fish*)	Fiskôs.
Acc.	Fisk	Fiskans.
Dat.	Fiska	Fiskam.
Gen.	Fiskis	Fiskê.

Feminine.

Nom.	Brûþs (*a Bride*)	Brûþeis.
Acc.	Brûþ	Brûþins.
Dat.	Brûþai	Brûþim.
Gen.	Brûþais	Brûþê.

These may be compared with the Saxon declensions as given in *p.* 7. *viz. Aúgô* with *Eáge*, *Manna* with *Nama*, *Tuggô* with *Tunge*, *Vaúrd* with *Leáf*, *Fisks* with *Smiδ*, and *Brûþs* with *Spræ'c.*

Declension of Weak Adjectives in Mœso-Gothic.

	Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
		Singular.	
Nom.	Blindô	Blinda	Blindô.
Acc.	Blindô	Blindan	Blindôn.
Dat.	Blindin	Blindin	Blindôn.
Gen.	Blindins	Blindins	Blindôns.
		Plural.	
Nom.	Blindôna	Blindans	Blindôns
Acc.	Blindôna	Blindans	Blindôns
Dat.	Blindam	Blindam	Blindôm
Gen.	Blindônê	Blindanê	Blindônô.

Compare the Weak Inflection in Mœso-Gothic with the *Definite* Inflection in A. S. Each may be called the Inflection in *-n*. It may be remarked, that in the Icelandic adjectives the characteristic letter *-n* is completely lost.

Declension of Strong Adjectives in Mœso-Gothic.

		Singular.	
Nom.	Blindata	Blinds	Blinda.
Acc.	Blindata	Blindana	Blinda.
Dat.	Blindamma	Blindamma	Blindái.
Gen.	Blindis	Blindis	Blindáizôs.
		Plural.	
Nom.	Blinda	Blindái	Blindôs.
Acc.	Blinda	Blindans	Blindôs.
Dat.	Blindáim	Blindáim	Blindáim.
Gen.	Blindáizê	Blindáizê	Blindáizô.

Compare the Strong Inflection M. G. with the Indefinite Inflection in A. S. and Icelandic; observing that in the Neuter form *Blindata* M. G. we have the sound of *-t*, as in Icelandic.

The assertion made at the end of § 4, was, not that in the Teutonic tongues there were no Neuter forms in *t*, but that they were not *prominent points of language.*

The Conjugation of the M. G. is as follows. It may be compared with that of the Icelandic in § 4. From the Anglo-Saxon it differs most in its Plural Persons.

		Indicative. M. G.	A. S.	*Subjunctive.* M. G	A. S.
		Present.		*Present.*	
Sing.	1.	Sôk-ja	Lufie.	Sôkjáu	Lufige.
	2.	Sôk-eis	Lufast.	Sôkjáis	
	3.	Sôk-eiþ	Lufað.	Sôkjái	
Plur.	1.	Sôk-jam	Lufiað.	Sôkjáima	Lufion.
	2.	Sôk-eiþ	Lufiað.	Sôkjáiþ	
	3.	Sôk-jand	Lufiað.	Sôkjáina	
		Præt.		*Præt.*	
Sing.	1.	Sôkida	Lufode.	Sôkidêdjáu	Lufode.
	2.	Sôkides	Lufodest.	Sôkidêdeis	
	3.	Sôkida	Lufode.	Sôkidêdi	
Plur.	1.	Sôkidêdum	Lufodon.	Sôkidêdeima	Lufodon.
	2.	Sôkidêduþ	Lufodon.	Sôkidêdeiþ	
	3.	Sôkidêdun	Lufodon.	Sôkidêdeina	

Add to these, as points of difference on the side of the Mœso-Gothic:

1st. The possession of a Dual Number.

2nd. The possession of a *Passive* form.

3rd. A Past tense formed, like that of the Greeks (and Latin *cucurri*, &c. &c.), by means of a reduplication.

The Conjugation of the Auxiliary Verb in Mœso-Gothic is as follows. It may be compared with the A. S., § 4.

Indicative. Pres.		*Subjunctive. Pres.*	
Sing.	*Plur.*	*Sing.*	*Plur.*
1. Im (*I am*)	Sijum.	1. Sijáu	Sijáima.
2. Is	Sijuþ.	2. Sijáis	Sijáiþ.
3. Ist	Sind.	3. Sijái	Sijáina.
Præt.		*Præt.*	
1. Vas	Vêsum.	1. Vêsjáu	Vêseima.
2. Vast	Vêsuþ.	2. Vêseis	Vêseiþ.
3. Vas	Vêsun.	3. Vêsei	Vêseina.

Inf. Visan and Sijan—(*to be*).

Part. Visands—(*being*).

§ 6. In comparing the Anglo-Saxon with the Old-Frisian we first notice what is called the Transition of Letters.

á in Frisian corresponds to *eá* in A.S.; as *Dád, rád, lás, strám, bám, cáp, áre, háp,* Frisian; *Deád, reád, leás, streám, beám, ceáp, eáre, heáp,* Saxon; *Dead, red, loose, stream, tree* (boom), *bargain* (cheap, chapman), *ear, heap,* English.

é, Frisian, corresponds to [a]), the A. S. *á;* as *éth, téken, hél, bréd,* Fris.; *áþ, tácen, hál, brád,* Saxon; *oath, token, hale, broad,* English; —[b]), to A. S. *æ; hér, déde, bréda,* Frisian; *hær, dæd, brædan,* A. S.; *hair, deed, roast,* English.

e to *ea* and *æ* A. S. — Frisian *Thet,* A. S. *þæt,* Engl. *That.* Fris. *gers,* A. S. *gærs,* Engl. *grass.*—Also to *eo; Prestere,* Fr.; *Preost* A. S. *Priest* Engl.; *Berch* Fr. *Beorh* A. S.; *Hill* (*berg,* as in *iceberg*) Engl.; *Melok,* Fr. *Meoloc* A. S. *Milk* Engl.

i to *eo* A. S.—Fr. *Irthe* A. S. *Eorðe;* Fris. *Hirte* A. S. *Heorte: Fir* A. S. *Feor* = in English *Earth, Heart, Far.*

já = *eo* A. S. as *Bjada, beódan, bid—Thet fjarde, feorðe, the fourth—sják, seóc, sick.*

ju = *y* or *eo* A. S. *rjucht, ryth, right — Frjund, freond, friend.*

Dsz = A. S. *cg,* Fr. *sedza, lidzja;* A. S. *secgan, Licgan;* Engl. *to say, to lie.*

Tz, ts, sz, sth = A. S. *c* or *ce;* as *szereke,* or *sthereke* Frisian, *cyrice* A. S. *Church* Engl. *szetel* Fr. *cytel* A. S. *kettle* English.

ch Fr. = *h* A. S. as *thjách* Fr. *þeóh* A. S. *Thigh* Engl.—*Berch, Beórh, Hill* (Berg)—*Dochter, Dohtor, Daughter,* &c. &c.

As a general statement we may say, that in the Tran-

sition of Letters the Frisian corresponds with the A. S. more closely than it does with any other language. It must, moreover, be remarked that, in such pairs of words as *Frjund* and *Freond*, the difference (as far at least as the *e* and *j* are concerned) is a mere difference of orthography. Such also is probably the case with the words *déd* and *dœd*, and many others.

The Anglo-Saxon inflection of [a]) Substantives ending in a Vowel, [b]) Substantives ending in a Consonant, [c]) Adjectives with an indefinite, [d]) Adjectives with a definite sense, [e]) Verbs Active and [f]) Verbs Auxiliar, may be seen in the comparison between the A. S. and the Icelandic. The corresponding inflections in Frisian are as follows.

A.

Substantives ending in a Vowel.

		Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	'Are (*an ear*)	Campa (*a champion*)	Tunge (*a tongue*).
	Acc.	'Are	Campa	Tunga.
	Dat.	'Ara	Campa	Tunga.
	Gen.	Ará	Campa	Tunga.
Plur.	*Nom.*	'Ara	Campa	Tunga.
	Acc.	'Ara	Campa	Tunga.
	Dat.	'Aron	Campon	Tungon.
	Gen.	'Arona	Campona	Tungona.

B.

Substantives ending in a Consonant.

		Neuter.	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Skip (*a ship*)	Hond (*a hand*).
	Acc.	Skip	Hond.
	Dat.	Skipe	Hond.
	Gen.	Skipis	Hondc.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Skipu	Honda.
	Acc.	Skipu	Honda.
	Dat.	Skipum	Hondum (-on).
	Gen.	Skipa	Honda.

With respect to the Masculine Substantives terminating in a Consonant, it must be observed that in A. S. there are two modes of Declension; in one, the Plural ends in *-s;* in the other, in *-a.* The specimen in § 4 represents the first of these modes only. To this the Frisian is essentially different. With the second it has a close alliance. e. g.:

		Saxon.	*Frisian.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Sunu (*a son*)	Sunu.
	Acc.	Sunu	Sunu.
	Dat.	Suna	Suna.
	Gen.	Suna	Suna.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Suna	Suna.
	Acc.	Suna	Suna.
	Dat.	Sunum	Sunum.
	Gen.	Sunena	(Sunena).

C.

Indefinite Declension of Adjectives.

		Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Gód	Gód	Gód.
	Acc.	Gód	Gódene	Góde.
	Dat.	Góda (-um)	Góda (-um)	Gódere.
	Gen.	Gódes	Gódes	Gódere.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Góde	Góde	Góde.
	Acc:	Góde	Góde	Góde.
	Dat.	Gódum (-a)	Gódum (-a)	Godum (-a).
	Gen.	Gódera	Gódera	Gódera.

D.

Definite.

		Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Góde	Góda	Góde.
	Acc.	Góde	Góda	Góda.
	Dat.	Góda	Góda	Góda.
	Gen.	Góda	Góda	Góda.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Góda	Góda	Góda.
	Acc.	Góda	Góda	Góda.
	Dat.	Góda (-on)	Góda (-on)	Góda (-on).
	Gen.	Góda (-ona)	Góda (-ona)	Góda (-ona).

E.

The Persons of the Present Tense.

Indicative Mood.

Sing.	1. Berne	*I Burn.*
	2. Bernst	*Thou Burnest.*
	3. Bernth	*He Burns.*
Plur.	1. Bernath	*We Burn.*
	2. Bernath	*Ye Burn.*
	3. Bernath	*They Burn.*

In the Inflection of the Verbs there is between the Frisian and A. S. this important difference. In A. S. the Infinitive ends in *an*, *Macian*, to Make, *Læran*, to Learn, *Bærnan*, to Burn; whilst in Frisian it ends in *a*, as *Maka*, *Léra*, *Berna*.

F.

The Auxiliar Verb Wesa, *To Be.*

Indicative.

	Present.		*Past.*	
Sing.	1. Ik ben		1. Ik	Was.
	2. ?		2. Thú	
	3. Hi is		3. Hi	
Plur.	1. Wi	Send	1. Wi	Weron.
	2. I		2. I	
	3. Hja		3. Hja	

Subjunctive.

	Present.	*Past.*
Sing.	1. 2. 3. Se	1. 2. 3. Wére.
Plur.	1. 2. 3. Se	1. 2. 3. Wére.

Infin. Wesa. *Pr. Part.* Wesande. *Past Part.* E-wesen.

The Frisian Numerals (to be compared with those of the Anglo-Saxons, § 4.) are as follows:—*E'n*, *Twá*, *Thrjú*, *Fjúwer*, *Fif*, *Sex*, *Sjúgun*, *Achta*, *Njugun*, *Tian*, &c. &c. Of these the three first take an Inflection, e. g. *En*, like

Gode, and the Adjectives, has both a Definite and an Indefinite form, *En*, and *Thet ene;* whilst *Twa* and *Thrjú* run as follows:—*Nom.* and *Acc. Neut.* Twa; *Masc.* Twene; *Fem.* Twa; *Dat.* Twám; *Gen.* Twira.—*Nom.* and *Acc. Neut.* Thrju; *Masc.* Thre; *Fem.* Thrja; *Dat.* Thrim; *Gen.* Thrira.

In respect to the Pronouns, there is in the Old Frisian no Dual Number as there is in Anglo-Saxon. On the other hand, however, the Frisians (whilst they have no such form as *his*) possess, like the Icelandic, the inflected adjectival Pronoun *Sin*, corresponding to the Latin *Suus:* whilst, like the Anglo-Saxons, and unlike the Icelanders, they have nothing to correspond with the Latin *se.*

In Frisian there is between the Demonstrative Pronoun, used as an Article, and the same word, used as a Demonstrative in the limited sense of the term, the following difference of Declension:—

THE ARTICLE.

		Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Thet	Thi	Thjú.
	Acc.	Thet	Thene	Thá.
	Dat.		Thá	There.
	Gen.		Thes	There.
Plur.	*Nom.*		Thá.	
	Acc.		Thá.	
	Dat.		Thá.	
	Gen.		Théra.	

PRONOUN.

The Demonstrative in the limited sense of the word.

		Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Thet	Thi	Se.
	Acc.	Thet	Thene	Se.
	Dat.		Tham	There.
	Gen.		Thes	There.

PRONOUN.

The Demonstrative in the limited sense of the word.

Plur.	*Nom.*	Se.
	Acc.	Se.
	Dat.	Thám.
	Gen.	Théra.

The Saxons draw no such a distinction. With them the Article and Demonstrative is declined as follows:—

		Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	þæt	Se	Seo.
	Acc.	þæt	þone	þá.
	Dat.		þam	þæ're.
	Gen.		þæs	þæ're.
Plur.	*Nom.*		þá.	
	Acc.		þá.	
	Dat.		þám.	
	Gen.		þára.	

The Glossarial affinity between A. S. and Frisian is shown in the following list of words taken from Rask's Preface to his Frisian Grammar:—

Frisian.	*A. S.*	*English.*
'Age	Eáge	*Eye.*
Háved	Heáfod	*Head.*
Kind	Cild	*Child.*
Erva	Eafora	*Heir.*
Drochten	Drihten	*Lord.*
Nacht	Niht	*Night.*
Réd	Ræ'd	*Council (Rede).*
Déde	Dæ'd	*Deed.*
Nose	Nasu	*Nose.*
'Ein	'Agen	*Own.*
Kápie	Ceapige	*I buy (Chapman).*
Dúa	Dón	*To do.*
Slá	Sleán	*Slay.*
Gunga	Gangan	*Go (Gang).*

So in respect to the construction. The Saxon runs—Þis syndon þá dómas þe Æþelbirht Cyning asette on Augustinus Dæge: Godes Feoh and Ciricean twelf gylde, Bisceopes Feoh nygon gylde, Preostes Feoh nygon gylde.—This is in Frisian, Thit sent thá dóma ther Æþelberht Kining asette on Augustinus dej, Godes fjách and sthereka twilif gylde, Bisceopes fjách njúgun gylde, Presteres fjách njúgun gylde—*These are the Laws (Dooms) that Æthelbert King set on Augustin's Day: God's fee and the Church's* 12 *as a payment, the Bishop's fee* 9 *as a payment, the Priest's fee* 9 *as a payment.—Æthelbert's Laws.*

Recapitulating, we find that the chief distinction between the A. S. and the Frisian lies,

1st, in the absence, in Frisian, of a Plural form in *s*—like *Smiðas*;

2nd, in the different termination of the Infinitive: A. S. *lufian*—Fr. *lufa.*

It is not thought necessary to exhibit the difference between Dialects of the same language. To the special notice of the English Dialects Chapter V. is devoted.

In this Chapter there has been an attempt to do two things: First, to exhibit the *general* likeness between Stocks, Branches, &c.; and, Secondly, to show the *special* affinities between certain languages allied to our own, and of the Gothic stock.

CHAPTER II.

ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 7. THE language spoken over Great Britain at the invasion of Julius Cæsar was of the Celtic stock.

Of this Celtic stock there are two branches.

1st. The British, or the Cambrian branch, represented by the present Welsh, and containing, besides that language, the Cornish of Cornwall and the Armorican of the French province of Bas Bretagne.

2ndly. The Gaelic, or the Erse branch, represented by the present Irish Gaelic, and containing besides, the Gaelic of the Highlands of Scotland, and the Manks of the Isle of Man.

SPECIMENS.

Welsh (Cambrian).

LUKE xv. 11—19.

11. Yr oedd gan ryw wr ddau fab:

12. A 'r jeuangaf o honynt a ddwedoddwrth *ei* dâdd, Fy nhâd, dyro i mi y rhan a ddigwydd o 'r da. Ac efe a ranodd iddynt *ei* fywyd.

13. Ac yn ôl yehydig ddyddiau y mâb jeuangaf a gasglodd y cwbl ynghŷd, ac a gymmerth ei daith i wlâd bell; ac yno efe a wasgarodd ei dda, gan fyw yn affrallon.

14. Ac wedi iddo dreulio 'r cwbl, y cododd newyn mawr trwy 'r wlâd honno; ac yntef a ddechreuodd fod mewn eisiau.

15. Ac efe a aeth, ac a lynodd wrth un o ddinaswyr y wlâd honno; ac efe a 'i hanfonodd ef i 'w faefydd i borthi môch.

16. Ac efe a chwennychai lenwi ei fol â 'r cibau a fwytai 'r môch ; ac ni roddodd neb iddo.

17. A phan ddaeth arto ei hur, efe addywedodd, Pa sawl gwâs cyflog o 'r ciddo fy nhâd sydd yn cael eu gwala a 'i gweddill o fara, a minnau yn marw o newyn !

18. Mi a godaf, ac a âf at fy nhâd, ac a ddwyedaf wrtho, Fy nhâd, pechais yn erbyn y nef, ac o'th flaen dithau.

19. Ac mwyach nid ydwyf deilwng i'm galw yn fâb i ti : gwna si fel un o'th weision cyflog.

Armorican of Bas Bretagne (Cambrian).

THE SAME.

11. Eunn dén en doa daou vab.

12. Hag ar iaouanka anézhò a lavaraz d'he dâd.—Va zâd, ro d'in al lòden zanvez a zigouéz d'in. Hag hén a rannaz hé zanvez gant-ho.

13. Hag eunn nébeûd dervésiou goudé, ar mâb iaounka, ô véza dastumet kémend en doa en em lékéaz enn hent évit mond étrézég eur vrô bell meûrbeá, hag énô é tispiñaz hé zanvez ó véva gant gadélez.

14. Ha pa en doé dispiñet kémend en doa, é c'hoarvézaz eunn naouégez vrâz er vrô-ze, hag é teûaz, da ézommékaat.

15. Kuid éz éaz eta, hag en em lakaad a réaz é gòpr gand eunn dén eûz ar vro. Hag hé man hen kasaz enn eunn ti d'ézhan war ar méaz, évit mesa ar móc'h.

16. C'hoantéed en divije leûña he góf gand ar c'hlosou a zebré ar môc'h : ha dén na rôé d'ézhan.

17. Hôgen ô veza distrôed d'ezhan hé unar, é lavaraz : a béd gòpraer zô é ti va zâd hag en deûz bara é leiz, ha mé a varv aman gand ann naoun !

18. Sévet a rinn, hag éz inn étrézé va zad, hag é livirinn d'ezhan : Va zâd, pech 'ed em euz a eneb ann env hag enn da enep!

19. N'ounn két talvoudek pello 'ch da véza galved da vâb : Va zigémer ével unar euz da c'hôpraerien.

Irish Gaelic (Gaelic).

THE SAME.

11. Do bhádar diás mac ag duine áirighe :

12. Agus a dubhairt an ti dob óige aca re *na* athair, Athair, tabhair dhamh an chuid roitheas *misi* dod mhaóin. Agus do roinn seision a mhaoin eatorra.

13. Agus tar éis bheagáin aimsire ag cruinniughadh a choda uile don mhac dob óige, do chúaidh sé air coigerigh a dtalamh imchian, agus do dhiombail se ann sin a mhaóin lé na bheathaidh báoth-chaithfigh.

14. Agus tar éis a choda uile do chaitheamh dhó, deirigh gorta romhór ann sa tír sin ; agus do thosaigh seision ar bheith a ríachdanus.

15. Agus do imthigh sé roimhe agus do cheangal sé e féin do cháthruightheoir don tír sin ; noch do chuir fá na dhúichte a mach é do bhúachuilleachd muc.

16. Agus bá mhián leis a bholg do líonadh do na féithléoguibh do ithidís na muca : agus ní thugadh éunduine dhó íad.

17. Agus an tan do chuimhnigh sé air féin, a dubhairt sé, Gá mhéd do luchd tuarasdail matharsa aga bhfúil iomaredid aráin, agus misi ag dul a múghd lé gorta !

18. Eiréochaidh mé agus rachaidh mé dionnsuighe mathair, agus deáruidh me ris ; A athair ! do pheacaid mé a naghaidh neimhe agusad fhíadhnuisisi.

19. Agus ní fiú mé feasda do mhacsa do ghairm dhoim : déana mé mar áon dod luchd thuarasduil.

Scotch Gaelic (Gaelic).

THE SAME.

11. Bha aig duine àraidh dithis mhac :

12. Agus thubhairt *mac* a b'òige dhiubh r' *a athair*, Athair, thoir dhomhsa a' chuid-roim a thig *orm*, do *d* mhaoin. Agus roinn e eatorra a bheathacahadh.

13. Agus an déigh beagain do láithibh, chruinnich am mac a b'òige a chuid uile, agus ghabh e a thurus do dhùthaich fad air astar, agus an sin chaith e a mhaoin le beatha struidheasaich.

14. Agus an uair achaith e a *chuid* uile, dh' éirich gorta ro mhòr san tìr sin ; agus thòisich e ri bhi ann an uireasbhuidh.

15. Agus chaidh e agus cheangail se e féin ri aon do shaor-dhaoinibh na dùcha sin : agus chuir ed' fhearan e, a bhiadhadh mhuc.

16. Agus bu mhiann leis a bhrù a lìonadh do na plaosgaibh a bha na mucan ag itheadh ; oir cha d' thug neach air bith dha.

17. Agus un uair a thainig e chuige féin, thubhairt e, Cia lìon do luchd tuarasdail m'atharsa aig am bheil aran gu leoir agus r' a sheachnadh, 'nuair a ta mise a' bàsachadh le gorta !

18. Eiridh me, agus théid omi dh' ionnsuidh m' athar, agus their mi ris, athair, pheacaich mi 'n aghaidh fhlaitheanais, agus a' d' là thairsa.

19. Agus cha 'n fhiu mi tuilleadh gu 'n goirte do mhacsa dhiom : deon mi mar aon do d' luchd tuarasdail.

Manks (Gaelic).

THE SAME.

11. Va daa vac ec dooinney dy row :

12. As doort y fer saa rish e ayr ; Ayr ! cur dooys yn ayrn dy chooid ta my chour. As rheynn eh e chooid orroo.

13. As laghyn ny lurg shen, hymsee yn mac saa ooilley cooidjagh as ghow eh jurnah gys cheer foddey, as ayns shen hug eh jummal er e chooid liorish baghey rouanagh.

14. As tra va ooilley baarit eihey, dirree genney vooar ayns y cheer shen ; as ren eh toshiaght dy ve ayns feme.

15. As hie eh as daill eh eh-hene rish cummaltagh jeh'n cheer shen; as hug eshyn eh magh gys ny magheryn echey dy ve son bochilley muickey.

16. As by-vian lesh e volg y lhieeney lesh ny bleaystyn va ny muckyn dy ee : as cha row dooinney erbee hug cooney da.

17. As tra v'eh er jeet huggey hene, dooyrt eh, Nagh nhimmey sharvaant failt t'ee my ayr ta nyn saie arran oc, as fooilliagh, as ta mish goll mow laccal beaghey !

18. Trog-ym orrym, as hem roym gys my ayr, as jir-ym rish, Ayr ! ta mee er n'yannoo peecah noi niau, as kiongoyrt rhyt's.

19. As cha vel mee ny-sodjey feeu dy ve enmyssit dty vac : dell rhym myr rish fer jeh dty harvaantyr failt.

The precise relationship of the Cornish to the Welsh I am unable to state. From specimens, however, given in Lhuyd's Archæologia, it is my impression that they differed from each other not as dialects but as languages.

For the proof that the Celtic stock is Indo-Germanic, see Pritchard's Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations.

For the proof that the Gaelic and Cambrian are related as branches, and consequently that they are both Celtic, see Appendix A of the present work.

§ 8. The Celtic elements of the present English (small as they are) fall into four Classes.

1st. Those that are of late introduction, and cannot be called original and constituent parts of the language. Such

are (amongst others) the words *Flannel*, *Crowd* (a fiddle), from the Cambrian, and *Kerne* (an Irish foot-soldier), *galore* (enough), *tartan*, *plaid*, &c. &c. from the Gaelic branch.

2ndly. Those that are common to both the Celtic and Gothic stocks, and are Indo-European rather than either Welsh, or Gaelic, or Saxon. Such (amongst others) are *brother*, *mother*, in Celtic *Brathair*, *Mathair;* the Numerals, &c.

3rdly. Those that have come to us from the Celtic, but have come to us through the medium of another language. Such are *Druid* and *Bard*, whose *immediate* source is, not the Celtic but, the Latin.

4thly. Those that have been retained from the original Celtic of the island, forming genuine, original, and constituent elements of our language. Of these the list is of small though undetermined extent. It comprises little save the proper names of rivers and districts (*The Thames*, *Kent*, &c. &c.), and the common names of certain geographical localities, as *Strath* (a valley); these latter being often transformed into proper names.

To these, a fifth Class may perhaps be added, containing those words which, although not forming a part of our current language, are found amongst the *Provincialisms* of the districts that come (or came) in contact with the Welsh, the Cornish, or the Gaelic. For these the glossaries of Devonshire and Cornwall, of Gloucestershire and Shropshire, of Cumberland and Westmoreland, &c. &c., have to be ransacked. In the Herefordshire vocabulary I find the Welsh term *Gwethall*, meaning *Household Stuff*, and the Welsh form *Gwlanen*, equivalent to *Flannel*. In Hallamshire Mr. Hunter finds a single term of Celtic origin, which he forbears to quote.

In the *grammatical* structure of our language not a vestige of the Celtic remains.

Upon the particular *branch* of the Celtic that was spoken at the invasion of Cæsar, I venture no opinion.

In Wales, in Ireland, and in the Highlands of Scotland it was, in all probability, the Mother-tongue of the present Welsh and Gaelic respectively. The language of Cornwall was, by a parity of reasoning, the Mother-tongue of the Cornish, lately extinct; while in Cumberland, in Westmoreland, and in the district of Strathclyde, the language was akin to the Welsh of Wales.

Respecting, however, the language of the rest of Britain, it is only safe to predicate thus much: *viz.* that it was Celtic, and that it was the Celtic that was spoken in Gaul. But whether this language of Gaul was Cambrian Gaelic, or belonging to a *third* branch of the Celtic stock, now extinct, we have no certain data for ascertaining. The Geography indicates the Cambrian branch; but certain Celtic Etymologists traverse the question by the statement that the proper names of Ancient Gaul are Irish or Scotch, rather than Welsh or Armorican.

§ 9. Of the Roman introduced by Cæsar and his successors, the few words remaining are those that relate to military affairs, *viz. Street* (*Strata*); *Coln* (as in Lincoln, *Lindi Colonia*), from *Colonia*; *Chester* (as in Gloucester, *Glevæ Castra*), from *Castra*. The Latin words introduced between the time of Cæsar and of Hengist, may be called the Latin of the First Period, or the Latin of the Celtic Period.

§ 10. To define the Gothic element in the English, a preliminary view of the relations of the Anglo-Saxon to the other Gothic languages is necessary.

The Scandinavian branch of the Gothic stock comprehends, 1. The languages of Scandinavia, the Norwegian and Swedish; 2. Of Denmark and Jutland; 3. Of Iceland; 4. Of the Feroe Isles. On the side of Lapland

the languages of this branch come in contact with the Laplandic and Finlandic (languages of the Finlandic stock, and not Indo-European); whilst in Sleswick they are bounded by the Low Germanic division of the Teutonic branch.

SPECIMENS.

Icelandic (Fareyinga-Saga — Ed. Mohnike).

Ok nú er þat eitthvert sinn um sumarit, at Sigmundr mælti til þóris: "Hvat mun verða, þo at við farim í skóg þenna, er hèr er norðr frá garði?" þórir svarar: "á því er mèr eingi forvitni," segir hann. "Ekki er mèr svâ gefit," segir Sigmundr, "ok þángat skal ek fara." "þú munt ráða hljóta," segir þórir, "en brjótum við þa boðorð fóstra míns." Nu fóru þeir, ok hafði Sigmundr viðaröxi eina i hendi sèr; koma i skóginn, ok í rjóðr eitt fagurt; ok er þeir hafa þar eigi leingi verit, þá heyra þeir björn mikinn harðla ok grimligan. þat var viðbjörn mikill, úlfgrár at lit. þeir hlaupa nu aptra á stiginn þan, er þeir höfðu þángat farit; stigrinn var mjór ok þraurigr, ok hleypr þórir fyrir, en Sigmundr síðar. Dýrit hleypr nú eptir þeim á stiginn ok verðr því þraungr stigrinn ok brotna eikrnar fyrir því. Sigmundr snýr þá skjótt út af stignum millum trjánna, ok bíðr þar til er dýrit kemr jafn-fram honum. þa höggr hann jafnt meðal hlusta á dýrinu með tveim höndum, svâ at exin sökkr. En dýrit fellr áfram, ok er dautt.

Feroic.

Nú vär so til ajna Ferina um Summari, at Sigmundur snakkaji so vi Towra: "Kvat man bagga, towat vìd färin uj henda Skowin, uj èr hèr noran-firi färin?" Towrur svärar; "Ikkji hävi e Hu at forvitnast ettir tuj," siir han. "Ikkji eri e so sintur," siir Sigmundur, "og häar skäl e fara." "Tù fert tå at råa," siir Towrur, "men tå browtum vid Forbo Fostirfäjir mujns." Nù fowru tajr, og Sigmundur heji ajna öksi til Brennuvì uj Hondini; tajr koma in uj Skowin, og å ajt väkurt rudda Plos men ikkji häva tajr veri här lájngji, firin tajr hojra kvödtt Bräk uj Skownun, og bråt ettir sujgja tajr ajna egvulia stowra Bjödn og gruiska. Tä vä ajn stowr Skowbjödn grågulmut å Litinun. Tair lejpa nù attir å Råsina, sum tajr höddu gingji ettir; Råsin vär mjåv og trong; Towrur lejpur undan og Sigmundur attanå. Djowri leipur nù ettir tajmum å Råsini; og nù verur Råsin trong kjå tuj, so at Ajkjinar brotnavu frå tuj. Sigmundur snujur tå kvikliani

útäf Råsini inimidlum Trjini, og bujar här til Djowri kjemur abajnt han. Tå höggur han bajnt uj Ojrnalystri å Djowrinum vi båvun Hondun, so at öxin sökkur in, og Djowri dettir bajnt framettir, og er standejt.

Danish.

Og nu var det engang om Sommeren, at Sigmund sagde til Thorer: "Hvad mon der vel kan flyde af, om vi end gaae hen i den Skov, som ligger her nordenfor Gaarden?" "Det er jeg ikken nysgjerrig efter at vide," svarede Thorer. "Ei gaar det mig saa," sagde Sigmund, "og derud maa jeg." "Du kommer da til at raade," sagde Thorer, "men da overtræde vi vor Fosterfaders Bud." De gik nu, og Sigmund havde en Vedöxe i Haanden; de kom ind i Skoven, og strax derpaa saae de en meget stor og grum Björn, en drabelig Skovejörn, ulvegraa af Farve. De löb da tilbage ad den samme Sti, ad hvilken de vare komne derhen. Stien var smal og trang; og Thorer löb forrest, men Sigmund bagerst. Dyret löb nu efter dem paa Stien, og Stien blev trang for det, og Træerne brödes i dets Löb. Sigmund dreiede da nu hurtig ud af Stien, og stillede sig imellem Træerne, og stod der, indtil Dyret kom frem lige for ham. Da fattede han öxen med begge hænder, og hug lige imellem örerne paa Dyret, saa at öxen sank i, og Dyret styrtede fremad, og var dödt paa Stedet.

English.

And now is it a time about the summer, that Sigmund spake to Thorir, "What would become, even if we two go into the wood (shaw), which here is North from the house?" Thorir answers, "Thereto there is to me no curiosity," says he. "So is it not with me," says Sigmund, "and thither shall I go." "Thou may'st counsel," says Thorir, "but we two break the bidding-word of foster-father mine." Now go they, and Sigmund had a wood-axe in his hands; they come into the wood, and into a fair place; and as they had not been there long, they hear a bear, big, fierce, and grim. It was a wood-bear, big, wolf-grey in hue. They run (leap) now back (after) to the path, by which they had gone thither. The path was narrow and strait; and Thorir runs first, and Sigmund after. The beast runs now after them on the path, and the path becomes strait, and broken oaks before it. Sigmund turns then short out of the path among the trees, and bides there till the beast comes even with him. Then cuts he even in between the ears of the beast with his two hands, so that the axe sinks, and the beast falls forward, and is dead.

To the Danish and Swedish the Icelandic stands in the same relation that the Anglo-Saxon does to the modern English, and the Latin to the Italian. It is their Mother-tongue. The Norwegian and Danish are identical languages. The Feroe is closely allied to the Icelandic.

§ 11. The Teutonic branch falls into two divisions, the High Germanic and Low Germanic. The High Germanic, to which the current German of the present day belongs, is bounded on the East by the Lithuanic, Slavonic, and Hungarian languages; whilst in the South, it touches the Italian and French. On the North, it joins the Low Germanic division. The English and Anglo-Saxon are Low Germanic; the Dutch of Holland is Low Germanic; and, in Germany (properly so called), the Baltic Provinces, Hanover, Oldenburg, and Westphalia are Low Germanic. In Courland and Livonia the Low German comes in contact with the Lettish of the Lithuanic stock; in Silesia and Lusatia with the Slavonic dialects. Its position in respect to the Danish (of the Scandinavian branch) has been indicated.

§ 12. It is in a High Germanic language (or rather it is in the oldest stage of the High German) that the most ancient specimen of any Gothic tongue has been preserved. This is the Gospel Translation of Ulphilas, referable to the third century. The language of Ulphilas is the language of the Goths of Mœsia. The Mœso-Gothic of Ulphilas is High Germanic. Old as it is, and truly as it is High Germanic, it cannot be called Old High German. Mœso-Gothic is the appropriate name. Old High German is the technical name for the next stage.

SPECIMEN.

LUKE i. 46—56.

Jah quaþ Mariam. Mikileid saivala meina Fan, jah svegneid ahma meins du Goþa nasjand meinamma. Unte insahu du hnaivenai þiujos seinaizos: sai allis fram hinnma nu audagjand mik alla kunja. Unte gatavida mis mikilein sa mahteiga, jah veih namo is. Jah armahairtei is in aldins aldê þaim ogandam ina. Gatavida svinthein in arma seinamma; distahida mikilþuhtans gahugdai hairtins seinis; gadrausida mahteigans af stolam, jah ushauhida gahnaividans; gredigans gasôþida þiuþe, jah gabignandans insandida lausans; hleibida Israela þiumagu seinamma, gamundans armahairteins, sva sve rodida du attam unsaraim Abrahaima jah fraiv is und aiv.

§ 13. The Old High German, called also Francic and Alemannic, was spoken in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, in Suabia, Bavaria, and Franconia. It is in the Old High German that the Krist of Otfrid, the Psalms of Notker, the Canticle of Willeram, the Glosses of Kero, the Vita Annonis, &c. &c. are composed.

SPECIMEN.

KRIST, i. 12. (Edit. Graff.)

Tho uuarun thar in lante hirta haltente;
Thes feches datun uuarta uuidar fianta.
Zi ín quam boto sconi, engil scinenti;
Joh uuurtun sie inliuhte fon himilisgen liohte.
Forahtun sie in tho gahun so sinan anasahun;
Joh hintarquamun harto thes Gotes boten uuorto.
Sprah ther Gotes boto sar. Ih scal íú sagen uuuntar.
Ju scal sin fon Gote heil: nales forahta nihein.
Ih scal iu sagen imbot, gibot ther himilisgo Got;
Ouh nist ther er gihorti so fronisg arunti.
Thes uuirdit uuorolt sinu zi cuuidon blidu,
Joh al giscaft thiu in uuorolti thesa erdun ist ouh dretenti.
Niuuui boran habet thiz lant theu himilisgon Heilant;
The ist Druhtin Krist guater fon iungeru muater.
In Bethleem thiue kuninga thie uuarun alle thanana,
Fon in uuard ouh giboran iu sin muater magad sconu.

Sagen ih íú, guate man, uuio ir 'nan seulut findan,
Zeichen ouh gizami thuruh thaz seltsani.
Zi theru burgi faret hinana, ir findet, so ih íú sageta,
Kind niuuui boranaz in kripphun gilegitaz.
Tho quam unz er zin tho sprah engilo heriscaf,
Himilisgu menigi, sus alle singenti —
In himilriches hohi si Gote guallichi ;
Si in erdu fridu ouh allen thie fol sin guates uuillen.

The Same, in English.

Then there was in the land herdsmen feeding :
Of their cattle they made watch against foes.
To them came a messenger fair, an angel shining,
And they became lit with heavenly light.
They feared, suddenly as on him they looked ;
And followed much the words of God's messenger :
Spake there God's messenger strait, " I shall to you say wonders.
To you shall there be from God health ; fear nothing at all.
I shall to you say a message, the bidding of the heavenly God,
Also there is none who has heard so glad an errand.
Therefore becomes his world for ever blythe,
And all creatures that in the world are treading this earth.
Newly borne has this land the heavenly Savior,
Who is the Lord Christ, good, from a young mother.
In Bethleem, of the kings they were all thence —
From them was also born his mother, a maid fair.
I say to you, good men, how ye him shall find,
A sign and token, through this wonder.
To your burgh fare hence, ye find, so as I to you said,
A child, new born, in a crib lying."
Then came, while he to them spake, of angels an host,
A heavenly retinue, thus all singing :
" In the heavenly kingdom's highth be to God glory ;
Be on earth peace also to all who are full of God's will."

§ 14. The Middle High German ranges from the Twelfth Century to the Reformation. The following quotation is from the Nibelungen-Lied.

SPECIMEN.

Der Nibelungen Not. St. 20—24. (*Ed. Lachmann.*)

Dô wuohs in Nidêrlanden eins rîchen küneges kint ;
Des vater hiez Sigemunt, sîn muoter Sigelint ;
In einer bürge rîche wîten wol bekant,
Niden bî dem Rîne ; diu was ze Santem genant.

Ich sage iu von dem degne, wie schœne der wart.
Sîn lîp vor allen schanden was vil wol bewart.
Stark unde mære wart sît der küene man —
Hey waz er grôzer êren ze diser werlde gewan.

Sifrit was geheizen der selbe degen guot ;
Er versuchte vil der rîche durch ellenthaften muot :
Durch sînes libes sterke reit er in menegui lant ;
Hey waz er sneller degne ze den Burgonden vant.

In sînen besten zîten, bî sînen jungen tagen,
Man möhte michel wunder von Sifride sagen ;
Waz êren an im wüehse und wie schœne was sîn lîp :
Sît heten in ze minne diu vil wætlichen wîp.

§ 15. The Low Germanic Division, of primary importance in the History of the English Language, since it is the division to which the Anglo-Saxon belongs, is currently said to comprise six languages, or rather four languages in different stages.

I. II.—The Anglo-Saxon and Modern English.

III. IV.—The Old Frisian and Modern Dutch.

V. The Old Saxon.

VI. The Platt-Deutsch, or Low German.

To the Dutch of Holland the Old Frisian bears the same relation that the Anglo-Saxon does to the present English. In a few districts of Friesland, in a parish or two in Westphalia, and again in Slesvig and the island of Heligoland, it is still spoken. Hence a division into East

Frisian, West Frisian, and North Frisian. One character (amongst others) of the North Frisian is that it possesses a Dual Number.

In respect to its stages we have the Old Frisian of the Asega-bog, the Middle Frisian of Gysbert Japicx, and the Modern Frisian of the present Freislanders, Westphalians, and Heligolanders.

Next to Anglo-Saxon and the Old Saxon, the Frisian is the language that most merits the attention of an Englishman.

Asega-bog, i. 3. p. 13, 14. (*Ed. Wiarda.*)

Thet is thiu thredde liodkest and thes Kynig Kerles ieft, theter allera monna ek ana sina eyna gode besitte umberavat. Hit ne se thet ma hini urwinne mith tele and mith rethe and mith riuchta thingate, sa hebbere alsam sin asega dema and dele to lioda londriuchte. Ther ne hach nen asega nenne dom to delande hit ne se thet hi to fara tha Keysere fon Rume esweren hebbe and thet hi fon da liodon ekeren se. Sa hoch hi thenne to demande and to delande tha fiande alsare friounde, thruch des ethes willa, ther hi to fara tha Keysere fon Rume esweren heth tho demande and to delande widuon and weson, waluberon and alle werlosa liodon like to helpande and sine threa knilinge. Alsa thi Asega nimth tha unriuchta mida and tha urlouada panninga and ma hini urtinga mi mith twam sine juenethon an thes Kyninges bonne sa ne hoch hi nenne dom mar to delande truch thet thi asega thi biteknath thene prestere, hwande hia send siande and hia skilun wesa agon there heliga Kerstenede, hia skilun helpa alle tham ther hiam seluon nauwet helpa ne muge.

TheSame, in English.

That is the third determination, and concession of King Charles, that of all men each one possess his own goods (house?) unrobbed. It may not be that any man overcome him with charge (tales), and with summons (rede), and with legal action. So let him hold as his Asega (judge) dooms and deals according to the Land-right of the People. There shall no Asega deal a doom unless it be that before the Cæsar of Rome he shall have sworn, and that he shall have been by the People chosen. He has then to doom and deal to foes as to friends, through the force (will) of the oath which he before the Cæsar of Rome has sworn, to doom and to deal to widows, and orphans, to wayfarers, and all defenceless people, to help them as his own kind in the third degree. If the Asega

take an illegal reward, or pledged money, and a man convict him before two of his Colleagues in the King's Court, he has no more to doom, since it is the Asega that betokens the Priest, and they are seeing, and they should be the eyes of the Holy Christendom, they should help all those who may nought help themselves.

Of the *Anglo*-Saxon it is considered unnecessary to give a specimen. To the *Old* Saxon, Chapter III. is especially devoted.

§ 16. The Platt-Deutsch, or Low German (the words being used in a restricted sense), is a term of lax application. It denotes all the Low Germanic dialects that are neither Frisian, Old Saxon, nor Anglo-Saxon. On the Eyder it comes in contact with the Jutish, on the Ems with the Dutch or Frisian. The following is the Platt-Deutsch of Lubeck in the fourteenth century. Of the Platt-Deutsch we have no specimens of equal antiquity with those of the Anglo-Saxon, the Old Saxon, or the Frisian. The Gospel Harmony of Tatian, by some considered intermediate to the High and Low German, belongs (in the opinion of the writer) most to the former division.

SPECIMEN.

Detmar's Chronicle, A. D. 1386.

In demesulven Jare schach den van Lubeke schaden an rove alse in Perden : dat deden Godendorpes denre unde hulpere. Der worden en del begrepen unde worden henget vor Lubeke. Darna schach, dat desulven Stratenrovere hadden des nachtes genomen to ene Dorpe, dat het Kurowe, unde hadden enen Bur darsulves dot geslagen. Des weren de Vogede van Lübeke unde van Molne uppe den velde. De Voget van Lubeke was en wolboren Man van Ridderen unde Knechten, unde heet Henneke Scharpenberch ; de van Molne was en berve Man, unde heet Wendelbarn. Do se dat Ruchte vornemen, do volgeden se den Morderen unde Stratenroveren ; id was Nacht unde kunden nene Slawe holden. Des ghat dar dre Wege in dat Land to Holsten, dar de Misdedere ute komen weren, de den Schaden dan hadden : aldus besenden de Vogede twe Wege, in deme dridden volgeden se sulven.

§ 17. We now approach the Mother-tongue of the English: *viz.* the Anglo-Saxon. At the earliest period of its history it was spoken between the Elbe and Eyder. How far it extended beyond these limits has yet to be determined. Neither is it known whether, within those districts, it was engrafted upon an older language, or whether it was itself the Aboriginal Tongue of the country. It was *Low* Germanic. Besides this, it was spoken where the Teutonic and Scandinavian branches touched.

Of the language of the Angles as distinguished from that of the Saxons, and *vice versâ*, we can assert nothing unconditionally.

If the two modes of speech differed at all they differed but as dialects, and were mutually intelligible.

Compared with each other, the one may have been a little more Frisian (*North*-Frisian), and the other a little more Danish.

To the Saxons and Angles (Anglo-Saxons) the Jutish must have been intelligible; so that if the Jutes spoke a Scandinavian dialect, it must have been the one that was most closely allied to the Teutonic languages. The Jutes formed the smallest portion of the Gothic invaders, so that their influence upon the English has been inconsiderable.

The situation of the *North* Frisians has been indicated. These Frisians took part in the Saxon invasion of England; but the influence of the Frisian upon the English has yet to be determined.

Of the four tribes enumerated the Frisians were the most Dutch, the Jutes the most Danish. Of the two Germanic divisions the *Low* most approaches the Scandinavian.

The descent of Hengist took place A. D. 449. At that time the language of England was Celtic mixed with Latin.

We pause upon the Anglo-Saxon. Practically speaking, it is to be considered less as an *element* of the present English than as the *Mother-tongue;* upon which a few words or phrases from other languages have been engrafted.

To repeat the account of its relations to the other languages of the world, the Anglo-Saxon and the Modern English are languages of the Low Germanic division of the Teutonic branch of the Gothic stock of the Indo-European tribe.

§ 18. The pirates that pillaged Britain, under the name of Danes, were not exclusively the inhabitants of Denmark. Of the three Scandinavian nations, the Swedes took the least share, the Norwegians the greatest in these invasions. Not that the Swedes were less piratical, but that they robbed elsewhere, in Russia, for instance, and in Finland.

The language of the three nations was the same, the differences being differences of dialect. The language that is now spoken in Iceland was once common to Scandinavia and Denmark. Whether this was aboriginal in *Denmark* is uncertain. In *Scandinavia* it was imported. The tongue that it supplanted was, in all probability, the Mother-tongue of the present Laplandic.

The Danes were seamen, and they were Pagans; so that, presuming that they were the importers of new words, we may expect to find the Danish (Norse or Scandinavian) additions to our language consisting either of nautical or of mythological terms. However, the determination of the Danish element is beset with peculiar difficulties.

The Danish (however small its quantity) that became incorporated with our language, under the reign of Canute and his sons, may be called the direct Danish (Norse or Scandinavian) element, in distinction to the indirect Danish of § 24.

§ 19. Of the Latin introduced by the Christianized

Saxon Sovereigns many words are extant. They relate chiefly to ecclesiastical matters, just as the Latin of the Celtic Period bore upon military affairs. *Mynster*, a Minster, *Monasterium; Portic*, a Porch, *Porticus; Cluster*, a Cloister, *Claustrum; Munuc*, a Monk, *Monachus; Bisceop*, a Bishop, *Episcopus; Arcebisceop*, Archbishop, *Archiepiscopus; Sanct*, a Saint, *Sanctus; Profost*, a Provost, *Propositus; Pall*, a Pall, *Pallium; Calic*, a Chalice, *Calix; Candel*, a Candle, *Candela; Psalter*, a Psalter, *Psalterium; Mæsse*, a Mass, *Missa; Pistel*, an Epistle, *Epistola; Prædic-ian*, to Preach, *Prædicare; Prof-ian*, to Prove, *Probare.*

The following are the names of foreign plants and animals; *Camell*, a Camel, *Camelus; Ylp*, Elephant, *Elephas; Fic-beam*, Fig-tree, *Ficus; Feferfuge*, Feverfew, *Febrifuga; Peterselige*, Parsley, *Petroselinum.*

Others are the names of articles of foreign origin, as *Pipor*, Pepper, *Piper; Purpur*, Purple, *Purpura; Pumic-stan*, Pumice-stone, *Pumex.*

The above-given list is from Guest's English Rhythms (B. iii. c. 3). It constitutes that portion of the elements of our language which may be called the Latin of the second, or Saxon Period.

§ 20. The French element appeared in our language with the Battle of Hastings (A. D. 1066); *perhaps in a slight degree during the reign of Edward the Confessor.*

Of the breaking-up of the Latin of the Classics, and of the languages that are derived from it, a detailed view is given in Appendix B. The present section exhibits only the *immediate* relations of the Norman-French, or as it was called after its introduction in England, the Anglo-Norman.

Between the Provincial French of the Northern Provinces, and the French of the Southern Provinces, there is

a difference, at the present day, at least of dialect, and perhaps of language. This is shown by the following specimens: the first, from the Canton of Arras, on the confines of Flanders; the second, from the Department of Var in Provence. The date of each is A. D. 1807.

I.

LUKE XV. 11.

11. Ain homme avoüait deoux garchéons.

12. L'pus jone dit a sain père. Main père, baillé m'chou qui doüo me 'r'v'nir ed vous bien, et leu père leu partit sain bien.

13. Ain n'sais yur, tro, quate, chéon jours après l'pus tiò d'chés déeux éféans oyant r'cuéllé tout s'n' héritt'main, s'ot'ainvoye dains nâin pahis gramain loüon, dû qu'il échilla tout s'n'argint ain fageant l'braingand dains chés cabarets.

14. Abord qu'il o eu tout bu, tout mié et tout drélé, il o v'nu adonc dains ch' pahis lo ainn' famaine cruüelle, et i c'mainchouait d' avoir fon-ye d' pon-ye (i. e. faim de pain).

II.

The same.

11. Un homé avié dous enfans.

12. Lou plus pichoun diguét a son päiré. Moun päiré, dounas mi ce què mi reven de vouastré ben; lou päiré faguet lou partagé de tout ce que poussédavo.

13. Paou de jours après, lou pichoun vendét tout ce què soun päiré li avié desamparat, et s'en anét dins un päis fouerço luench ounté dissipét tout soun ben en debaucho.

14. Quand aguét tou accaba, uno grosso famino, arribet dins aqueou päis et, leou, si veguét reduech à la derniero misèro.

Practically speaking, although in the central parts of France, the Northern and Southern dialects melt each into the other, the Loire may be considered as a line of demarcation between two languages; the term Language being employed because, in the Middle Ages, whatever may be their real difference, the Northern Tongue and the Southern

Tongue were dealt with, not as separate dialects, but as distinct languages; the Southern being called Provençal, the Northern Norman-French.

Of these two languages (for so they will in the following pages be called, for the sake of convenience) the Southern or Provençal approaches the dialects of Spain; the Valencian of Spain and the Catalonian of Spain being Provençal rather than standard Spanish or Castilian.

The Southern French is sometimes called the Langue d'oc, and sometimes the Limousin.

It is in the Southern French (Provençal, Langue d'oc, or Limousin) that we have the following specimen; *viz.* the Oath of Ludwig, sworn A. D. 842.

The Oath of the King.

Pro Deo amur et pro Xristian poblo et nostro commun salvament, d'ist di en avant, in quant Deus savir et podir me dunat, si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo, et in ajudha et in cadhuna cosa, si cum om per dreit son fradra salvar dist; in o quid il mi altresi fazet: et ab Ludher nul plaid nunquam prindrai qui, meon vol, cist meon fradre Karle in damno sit.

The Oath of the People.

Si Lodnuigs sagrament, que son fradre Karlo jurat, conservat; et Karlus, meos sendra, de suo part non lo stanit; si io returnar non l'int pois, ne io, ne neuls cui eo returnar int pois, in nulla ajudha contra Lodhuwig nun li iver.

The Same, in Modern French.

Pour de Dieu l'amour et pour du Chrétien peuple et le notre commun salut, de ce jour en avant, en quant que Dieu savoir et pouvoir me donne, assurément sauverai moi ce mon frère Charles, et en aide, et en chacune chose, ainsi comme homme par droit son frère sauver doit, en cela que lui à moi pareillement fera: et avec Lothaire nul traité ne onques prendrai qui, à mon vouloir, à ce mien frère Charles en dommage soit.

* * * * * * * *

Si Louis le serment, qu' à son frère Charles il jure, conserve ; Charles, mon seigneur, de sa part ne le maintient ; si je détourner ne l'en puis, ni moi, ne nul que je détourner en puis, en nulle aide contre Louis ne lui irai.

§ 22. The Norman-French, spoken from the Loire to the confines of Flanders, and called also the Langue d'oyl, differed from the Provençal in (amongst others) the following circumstances.

1st. It was of later origin; the southern parts of Gaul having been colonized at an early period by the Romans.

2nd. It was in geographical contact, not with the allied languages of Spain, but with the Gothic tongues of Germany and Holland.

It is the Norman-French that most especially bears upon the history of the English language.

The proportion of the original Celtic in the present languages of France has still to be determined. It may, however, be safely asserted that at a given epoch between the first and fifth centuries the language of Gaul was more Roman and less Celtic than that of Britain.

SPECIMEN.

From the Anglo-Norman Poem of Charlemagne.

Un jur fu Karléun al Seint-Denis muster,
Reout prise sa corune, en croiz seignat sun chef,
E ad ceinte sa espée : li pons fud d'or mer.
Dux i out e demeines e baruns e chevalers.
Li emperères reguardet la reine sa muillers.
Ele fut ben corunée al plus bel e as meuz.
Il la prist par le poin desuz un oliver,
De sa pleine parole la prist à reisuner :
" Dame, véistes unkes hume nul de desuz ceil
" Tant ben séist espée ne la corone el chef ?
" Uncore cunquerrei-jo citez ot mun espeez."
Cele ne fud pas sage, folement respondeit :
" Emperere," dist-ele, trop vus poez preiser.

" Uncore en sa-jo un ki plus se fait léger,
" Quant il porte corune entre ses chevalers ;
" Kaunt il met sur sa teste, plus belement lui set."

In the Northern French we must recognize not only a Celtic, and a Classical, but also a Gothic element: since Clovis and Charlemagne were no Frenchmen, but Germans: their language being *High*-Germanic. The High-Germanic element in French has still to be determined.

In the Northern French of *Normandy* there is a second Gothic element: *viz.* a Scandinavian element. By this the proper Northern French underwent a further modification.

Until the time of Scandinavians or Northmen, the present province of Normandy was called Neustria. A generation before the Norman Conquest, a Norwegian captain, named in his own country *Rolf*, and in France *Rollo*, or *Rou*, settled upon the coast of Normandy. What Hengist and the Germans were in Britain, Rollo and his Scandinavians were in France. The province took from them its name of Normandy. The *Norwegian* element in the Norman-French has yet to be determined. Respecting it, however, the following statements may, even in the present state of the question, be made:

1st. That a Norse dialect was spoken in Normandy at Bayeux, some time after the Battle of Hastings.

2nd. That William the Conqueror understood the Norse language.

3rd. That the names Jersey, Guernsey, and Alderney are as truly Norse names as Orkney and Shetland.

I close this prolonged account of the Norman-French with the following additional statements and notices.

1st. That the Norman-French as spoken in England takes the name of Anglo-Norman, the Norman-French of the Continent being called Franco-Norman.

2nd. That the French of Paris, as far as it differed from

the French of the Dutchy of Normandy, may be called French Proper, or simply French.

3rd. That on the confines of the Dutch language there was another dialect (or sub-dialect) of the Norman-French, viz. the Walloon, spoken in Liege, Brabant, &c. &c.

4th. That the name Romance (to be distinguished from Romanese*) is sometimes applied to the Provençal and Norman-French collectively, and sometimes to the Anglo-Norman alone.

§ 23. The Latin introduced between the Conquest and the reign of Henry VIII. (or the Revival of Learning) may be called the Latin of the Third Period. This was of two sorts, Direct and Indirect: Direct when, as in the Ecclesiastical Law, words were introduced at once from the Latin; Indirect when, as in the Common Law, and in the language of the Constitution, Latin words were introduced through the medium of the Anglo-Norman.

§ 24. The Norwegian, Danish, Norse or Scandinavian element of the Anglo-Norman (as in the proper names, *Guernsey*, *Jersey*, *Alderney*, and perhaps others,) constitutes the Indirect Scandinavian element of the English.

§ 25. Greek words (as such) were first introduced after the revival of literature. Words like *Deacon*, *Priest*, &c. &c. that had been previously introduced, were introduced through the Latin, or indirectly. The word *Church* in the Saxon periods proves no more in regard to a Greek element in English, than the word *Abbot* proves in respect to a Syrian one.

§ 26. Of Miscellaneous elements we have two sorts; those that are incorporated in our language, and are currently understood, (e. g. the Spanish word *Sherry*, the Arabic word *Alcali*, and the Persian word *Turban*,) and those that, even amongst the educated, are considered strangers.

* See Appendix B.

Of this latter kind (amongst many others) are the Oriental words, *Hummum*, *Kaftan*, *Gul*, &c. &c. Of these miscellaneous elements, (and we have words from upwards of twenty different languages,) the most remarkable are those from the Arabic (*Alkali*, *Alembic*, &c.), since it may be predicated of them that they generally refer to objects of a certain class, *viz.* to matters of Chemistry, or to matters of Astrology.

§ 27. To the careful reader of the present Chapter, two questions may appear to have been left untouched.

1st. The *proportion* wherein the different elements of our language enter into it.

2nd. The influence that they exert upon each other.

These points are postponed, not overlooked. The history of the languages that have been spoken in a particular country, is a different subject from the history of a particular language. The history of the languages that have been spoken in the United States of America is the history of *Indian* languages. The history of the language of the United States is the history of a Germanic language. In different degrees, however, the first question is, for the most part, involved in the second. In the language of the United States there are vestiges of the Aboriginal Indian. Such are the names of rivers like the Mississippi, and of mountains like the Alleghany. As the Indian is to the English of America, the Celtic is to the English of England, *viz.* the Aboriginal language, of which few traces remain, but those that do remain are, for the most part, the Proper Names of geographical localities.

§ 28. The remarks upon the Indian languages of America, upon the Celtic of England, and upon the Arabic, amongst our Miscellaneous elements, made in the two preceding sections, pave the way for a distinction between

the Historical Analysis of a Language, and the Logical Analysis of one.

Let the present language of England (for illustration's sake only) consist of 60,000 words. Of these let 50,000 be Anglo-Saxon, 5000 Anglo-Norman, 100 Celtic, 10 Latin of the First, 20 Latin of the Second, and 30 Latin of the Third Period, 50 Scandinavian, and the rest Miscellaneous. In this case the language is considered according to the historical origin of the words that compose it, and the analysis (or, if the process be reversed, the synthesis) is a Historical Analysis.

But it is very evident that the English, or any other language, is capable of being contemplated in another view, and that the same number of words may be very differently classified. Instead of arranging them according to the languages whence they are derived, let them be disposed according to the meanings that they convey. Let it be said, for instance, that out of 60,000 words, 10,000 are the names of natural objects, that 1000 denote abstract ideas, that 1000 relate to warfare, 1000 to church matters, 500 to points of chivalry, 1000 to agriculture, and so on through the whole. In this case the analysis (or, if the process be reversed, the synthesis) is not historical, but logical; the words being classed, not according to their origin, but according to their meaning.

Now so far as, in English, the names of geographical localities are Celtic, and so far as the terms of Chemistry are Arabic, the logical and historical analyses *coincide*. The coincidence of the analyses is an instrument of historical criticism.

For the coincidences between the historical and logical analyses in respect to the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman, the reader is referred to an article in the Edinburgh Review, No. CXLI.

CHAPTER III.

THE OLD SAXON.

§ 29. FROM the earliest mention, in the present volume, of the Germanic language which bears the same relation to the English that the Latin bears to the Italian, especial care has been taken to call it not simply *Saxon*, but *Anglo*-Saxon. This was done with the view of distinguishing it, as clearly as was possible, from the language that is the subject of the present chapter. In § 15 a notice was made, and an account was promised, of a Low-Germanic language, called neither simply Saxon, nor yet Anglo-Saxon, but *Old* Saxon.

The Saxons of the Elbe and Eyder, as is seen above, emigrated into England; and this, although but one of their excursions, indicates a separation of their language: 1stly, into the Saxon that was exported into England, 2ndly, into the Saxon of those who kept at home. Of the language of those who remained at home no trace has come down to us. Of the language, however, of a third division that left the Elbe and Eyder for the Rhine, we have (amongst others) a most important specimen, in the poem entituled "*Heliand*," the "*Healer*," or "*Saviour*."

This is a metrical Gospel Harmony, in a language similar to, but not identical with, the Anglo-Saxon, spoken on the Lower Rhine (but with its precise locality un-

determined), in the tenth century, by Saxon settlers that possessed themselves of that portion of Germany, just as the followers of Hengist and Horsa possessed themselves of England.

This is the language that, by the early Gothic scholars, is called Dano-Saxon, under the idea that in it could be found traces of the Danish of Canute's time.

§ 30. *Grammatical Structure of Old Saxon, as compared with Anglo-Saxon.*

Weak Substantives in Old Saxon.

	Neuter.	
	Singular.	*Plural.*
Nom.	Oga	Ogon ?
Acc.	Oga	Ogon ?
Dat.	Ogon ?	Ogum ?
Gen.	Ogon ?	Ogona ?
	Masculine.	
Nom.	Namo	Namon.
Acc.	Namon	Namon.

	Masculine.	
	Singular.	*Plural.*
Dat.	Namon	Namôn.
Gen.	Namon	Namônâ.
	Feminine.	
Nom.	Tunga	Tungûn.
Acc.	Tungûn	Tungûn.
Dat.	Tungûn	Tungûn.
Gen.	Tungûn	Tungônò.

Strong Substantives in Old Saxon.

	Neuter.	
	Singular.	*Plural.*
Nom.	Word	Word.
Acc.	Word	Word.
Dat.	Worda (-e)	Wordun.
Gen.	Wordas (-es)	Wordò.
	Masculine.	
Nom.	Fisc	Fiscôs.
Acc.	Fisc	Fiscôs.

	Masculine.	
	Singular.	*Plural.*
Dat.	Fisca (-e)	Fiscun (-on).
Gen.	Fiscas (-es)	Fiscò.
	Feminine.	
Nom.	Dâd	Dâdi.
Acc.	Dâd	Dâdi.
Dat.	Dâdi	Dâdjun.
Gen.	Dâdi	Dâdjò.

Inflection of Strong (Indefinite) Adjectives in Old Saxon.

	Singular.		
	Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Nom.	Blind	Blind	Blind.
Acc.	Blind	Blindan (-ana)	Blinda.
Dat.	Blindumu	Blinduma	Blindârò (-êrò).
Gen.	Blindas (-es)	Blindas (-es)	Blindârò (-êrò).

		Plural.	
	Neuter.	*Masculine.*	*Feminine.*
Nom.	Blindu	Blindâ (-ê)	Blindâ.
Acc.	Blindu	Blindâ (-ê)	Blindâ.
Dat.	Blindon (-un)	Blindon (-un)	Blindon (-un).
Gen.	Blindârô (-êrô)	Blindârô (-èrô)	Blindârô (-èrô).

The Weak (Definite) Inflection is precisely that of the Substantives *Ôga, Nama, Tunga.*

In respect to the Tenses, the Conjugation of the Old Saxon corresponds with that of the Anglo-Saxon.

For the Persons, see the Chapter, in Part III., upon the Persons of Verbs.

SPECIMEN.

§ 31. *Heliand* (pp. 12, 13. *Schmeller's Edition*).

Luc. II. 8—13.

Tho uuard managun cud,
Obar thesa uuidon uuerold.
Uuardos antfundun,
Thea thar ehuscalcos
Uta uuarun,
Uueros an uualitu,
Uuiggeo gomean,
Fehas aftar felda :
Gisahun finistri an tunc
Telatan an lufte ;
Endi quam lioht Godes,
Uuanum thurh thui uuolcan ;
Endi thea uuardos thar
Bifeng an them felda.
Sie uurdun an forhtun tho,
Thea man an ira moda ;
Gisahun thar mahtigna
Godes Engil cuman ;
The im tegegnes sprac.
Het that im thea uuardos—
" Uuiht ne antdredin
" Ledes fon them liohta.
" Ic scal eu quad he liobora thing,
" Suido uuarlico
" Uuilleon seggean,
" Cudean craft mikil.
" Nu is Krist geboran,
" An thesero selbun naht,
" Salig barn Godes,
" An thera Davides burg,
" Drohtin the godo.
" That is mendislo
" Manno cunneas,
" Allaro firiho fruma.
" Thar gi ina fidan mugun,
" An Bethlema burg,
" Barno rikiost.
" Hebbiath that te teena,
" That ic eu gitellean mag,
" Uuarun uuordun,
" That he thar biuundan *ligid*,
" That kind an enera cribbiun,

" Tho he si cuning obar al
" Erdun endi himiles,
" Endi obar eldeo barn,
" Uueroldes uualdand." [enun
Reht so he tho that uuord gesprac
So uuard thar engilo te them,
Unrim cunan,
Helag heriskepi,
Fon hebanuuanga,
Fagar folc Godes,
Endi filu sprakun,
Lofuuord manag,
Liudeo herron ;
Afhobun tho helagna sang.
Tho sie eft te hebanuuanga
Uundun thurh thiu uuolcan.
Thea uuardos hordun,
Huo thiu engilo craft
Alomahtigna God,
Suido uuerdlico,
Uuordun louodun.
" Diurida si nu," quadun sie,
" Drohtine selbun,
" An them hohoston
" Himilo rikea ;
" Endi fridu an erdu,
" Firiho barnun,
" Goduuilligun gumun,
" Them the God antkennead,
" Thurh hluttran hugi."

The Same, in English.

Then it was to many known,
Over this wide world.
The words they discovered,
Those that there, as horse-grooms,
Were without,
Men at watch,
Horses to tend,
Cattle on the field—
They saw the darkness in two
Dissipated in the atmosphere,
And came a light of God
—— through the welkin ;
And the words there
Caught them on the field.
They were in fright then
The men in their mood—
They saw the mighty
Angel of God come ;
That to them face to face spake.
It bade them (*in*) these words—
" Dread not a whit,
" Of mischief from the light.
" I shall to you speak glad (*lief*)
" Very true ; [things,
" Say commands (*wills*) ;
" Show great strength (*muckle*
" Now is Christ born, [*craft*).
" In this self-same night ;
" The blessed child of God,
" In David's city,
" The Lord the good.
" That is exultation
" To the races of men,
" Of all men the advancement ;
" There ye may find him
" In the city of Bethlehem,
" The noblest of children—
" Ye have as a token
" That I tell ye
" True words,
" That he there swathed (wound)
" The child in a crib, [lieth,
" Though he be King over all
" Earth and Heaven,
" And all the sons of men,
" Of the world the Ruler."
Right as he that word spake,
So was there of Angels to them,
In a multitude, come
A holy host,

From the Heaven-plains,
The fair folk of God,
And much they spake
Praise-words many,
To the Lord of Hosts (People).
They raised (*heaved*) the holy song,
As they back to the Heaven-plains
Wound through the welkin.
The words they heard,
How the strength of the Angels
The Almighty God,
Very worthily,
With words praised,
" Love (*dearness*) be there now,"
quoth they,
" To the Lord himself
" On the highest
" Kingdom of Heaven,
" And peace *on* earth
" To the children of men,
" Who know God,
" Through a pure mind."

For a further comparison between the Old Saxon and the Anglo-Saxon, see Foreign Quarterly, No. XIV.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH TO THE ANGLO-SAXON, AND THE STAGES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 32. THE relation of the present English to the Anglo-Saxon, is that of a *Modern* language to an *Ancient* one: the words *Modern* and *Ancient* being used in a defined and technical sense.

Let the word *Smiðum* illustrate this. *Smiðum*, the Dative Plural of *Smið*, is equivalent in meaning to the English *To Smiths*, or to the Latin *Fabris*. *Smiðum*, however, is a single Anglo-Saxon word (a Substantive and nothing more); whilst its English equivalent is two words (*i. e.* a Substantive with the addition of a Preposition). The letter *s*, in *Smiths*, shows that the word is Plural. The *-um*, in *Smiðum*, does this and something more. It is the sign of the *Dative Case* Plural. The *-um* in *Smiðum*, is the part of a word. The Preposition *to* is a separate word with an independent existence. *Smiðum* is the radical syllable *Smið*, *plus* the subordinate inflectional syllable *-um*, the sign of the Dative Case. *To Smiths* is the Substantive *Smiths*, *plus* the Preposition *to*, equivalent in power to the sign of a Dative Case, but different from it in form. As far, then, as the word just quoted is concerned, the Anglo-Saxon differs from the English thus. It expresses a given idea by a modifica-

tion of the form of the root, whereas the Modern English denotes the same idea by the addition of a Preposition. The Saxon Inflection is superseded by a combination of words.

The part that is played by the Preposition with Nouns, is played by the Auxiliaries (*have*, *be*, &c.) with Verbs.

The sentences in Italics are mere variations of the same general statement. (1.) *The earlier the stage of a given language the greater the amount of its inflectional forms, and the later the stage of a given language the smaller the amount of them.* (2.) *As languages become Modern they substitute Prepositions and Auxiliary Verbs for Cases and Tenses.* (3.) *The amount of inflection is in the inverse proportion to the amount of Prepositions and Auxiliary Verbs.* (4.) *In the course of time languages drop their inflection and substitute in its stead circumlocutions by means of Prepositions, &c. &c. The reverse never takes place.* (5.) *Given two modes of expression, the one inflectional* (*Smiðum,*) *the other circumlocutional* (to Smiths), *we can state that the first belongs to an early, the second to a late, stage of language.*

The present Chapter, then, showing the relation of the English to the Anglo-Saxon, shows something more. It exhibits the general relation of a modern to an ancient language. As the English is to the Anglo-Saxon, so are the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian, to the Old Norse; so also the Modern High German to the Mœso-Gothic; so the Modern Dutch of Holland to the Old Frisian; so, moreover, amongst the languages of a different stock, are the French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Romanese and Wallachian to the Latin, and the Romaic to the ancient Greek. So also the present Hindoo dialects to the Sanskrit, and the Persian to the Zend.

§ 33. Contrasted with the English, but contrasted with it only in those points where the ancient tongue is com-

pared with the modern one, the Anglo-Saxon has the following differences.

NOUNS.

Of Gender.)—In A. S. there are three Genders, the Masculine, the Feminine, and the Neuter. With *Adjectives* each Gender has its peculiar declension; with *Substantives* there are also appropriate terminations, but only to a certain degree; *e. g.* Of words ending in *a* (*Nama*, a Name, *Cuma*, a Guest), it may be stated that they are always Masculine; of words in *u* (*Sunu*, a Son, *Gifu*, a Gift), that they are never Neuter; in other words, that they are either Mas. or Fem.

The Definite Article varies with the Gender of its Substantive; *þæt Eage*, the Eye; *Se Steorra*, the Star; *Seo Tunge*, the Tongue.

Of Number.)—The Plural form in *-en* (as in *Oxen*), rare in English, was common in A. S. It was the regular termination of a whole Declension; *e. g. Eágan*, Eyes; *Steorran*, Stars; *Tungan*, Tongues. Besides this, the Anglo-Saxons had forms in *-u* and *-a*, as *Ricu*, Kingdoms; *Gifa*, Gifts. The termination *-s*, current in the present English, was confined to a single Gender and to a single Declension, as *Endas*, Ends; *Dagas*, Days; *Smiðas*, Smiths.

Of Case.)—Of these the Saxons had, for their Substantives, at least three; viz. the Nominative, Dative, Genitive. With the Pronouns and Adjectives there was a true Accusative form; and with a few especial words an Ablative or Instrumental one. *Smið*, a Smith; *Smiðe*, to a Smith; *Smiðes*, of a Smith. Plural, *Smiðas*, Smiths; *Smiðum*, to Smiths; *Smiða*, of Smiths—*He*, he; *Hine*, Him; *Him*, to Him; *His*, His.—*Se*, the; *þa*, the; *þy*, with the; *þam*, to the; *þæs*, of the.

Of the Dative in *-um*, the word *Whilom* (*at times, at whiles,*) is a still extant and an almost isolated specimen.

Of Declension.)—In A. S. it is necessary to determine the termination of a Substantive. There is the Weak, or Simple Declension for words ending in a Vowel (as *Eage, Steorra, Tunga*), and the Strong, or Complex Declension for words ending in a Consonant (*Smiδ, Spræc, Leáf*). The letters *i* and *u* are dealt with as Semivowels, Semivowels being dealt with as Consonants; so that words like *Sunu* and *Gifu* belong to the same Declension as *Smiδ* and *Spr'æc.*

That the form of Adjectives varies with their Definitude or Indefinitude, has been seen from § 4: Definite Adjectives following the inflection of the Simple; Indefinite ones that of the Complex Declension.

The detail of the Anglo-Saxon Declension may be collected from § 4.

The Anglo-Saxon Inflection of the Participles Present is remarkable. With the exception of the form for the Genitive Plural Definite (which, instead of *-ena*, is *-ra*,) they follow the Declension of the Adjectives. From the Masculine Substantives formed from them, and denoting the agent, they may be distinguished by a difference of Inflection.

		Participle.	*Substantive.*
		Wegferende—*Wayfaring.*	Wegferend—*Wayfarer.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	Wegferende	Wegferend.
	Acc.	Wegferendne	Wegferend.
	Abl.	Wegferende	Wegferende.
	Dat.	Wegferendum	Wegferende.
	Gen.	Wegferendes	Wegferendes.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Wegferende	Wegferendas.
	Dat.	Wegferendum	Wegferendum.
	Gen.	Wegferendra	Wegferenda.

Pronouns Personal.)—Of the Pronominal Inflection in Saxon, the character may be gathered from the Chapter upon Pronouns. At present, it may be stated that, like the Mœso-Gothic and the Icelandic, the Anglo-Saxon language possessed for the two First Persons a *Dual* Number; inflected as follows:

	1st Person.		*2nd Person.*	
Nom.	Wit	*We two.*	Git	*Ye two.*
Acc.	Unc	*Us two.*	Inc	*You two.*
Gen.	Uncer	*Of us two.*	Incer	*Of you two.*

Besides this, the Demonstrative Possessive and Relative Pronouns, as well as the Numerals *Twa* and *þreó*, had a fuller declension than they have at present.

VERBS.

Mood.)—The Subjunctive Mood that in the present English (with the exception of the Conjugation of the Verb Substantive,) differs from the Indicative only in the Third Person Singular, was in Anglo-Saxon inflected as follows:

Indicative Mood.

Pres. Sing.	1.	Lufige.	*Plur.*	1.	Lufiaþ.
	2.	Lufast.		2.	
	3.	Lufaþ.		3.	

Subjunctive Mood.

Pres. Sing.	1.	Lufige.	*Plur.*	1.	Lufion.
	2.			2.	
	3.			3.	

The Saxon Infinitive ended in *-an* (*Lufian*), and besides this there was a so-called Gerundial form, *to Lufigenne.*

Tense.)—In regard to Tense, the A. S. coincided with the English. The present language has two tenses, the Present and the Past; the Saxon had no more. This Past Tense the modern English forms either by addition

(*Love, Loved*), or by change (*Fall, Fell*). So did the Anglo-Saxons.

Number and Person.)—In the present English the termination *-eth* (*moveth*) is antiquated. In A. S. it was the only form recognized. In English the Plural Number (Indicative as well as Subjunctive) has no distinguishing inflection. It was not so in A. S. There, although the *Persons* were identical in form, the *Numbers* were distinguished by the termination *-að* for the Indicative, and *-n* for the Subjunctive. (*See above.*) For certain forms in the Second Conjugation, see the remarks on the forms *Drunk* and *Drank*, in Part III.

Such are the chief points in the Declension of Nouns and the Conjugation of Verbs that give a difference of character between the Ancient Anglo-Saxon and the Modern English: and it has already been stated that the difference between the New and the Old German, the Dutch and the Frisian, the Italian, &c. &c. and the Latin, the Romaic and the Greek, &c. &c. are precisely similar.

How far two languages pass with equal rapidity from their ancient to their modern, from their inflected to their uninflected state, (in other words, how far all languages alter at the same rate,) is a question that will be noticed in Chapter V. At present, it is sufficient to say, that (just as we should expect *à priori*,) languages do *not* alter at the same rate.

§ 34. Akin to the last question is a second one: *viz.* how far the rate of change in a given language can be accelerated by external circumstances. This second question bears immediately upon the history of the English language. The grammar of the current idiom compared with the grammar of the A. S. is simplified. How far was this simplification of the grammar promoted by the Norman Conquest? The current views exaggerate the influence

of the Norman Conquest and of French connexions. The remark of Mr. Price in his Preface to Warton, acceded to by Mr. Hallam in his Introduction to the Literature of Europe, is, that every one of the other Low Germanic Languages (affected by nothing corresponding to the Norman Conquest,) displays the same simplification of grammar as the Anglo-Saxon (affected by the Norman Conquest) displays. Confirmatory of this remark, it may be added, that compared with the Icelandic, the Danish and Swedish do the same. Derogatory to it is the comparatively complex grammar of the *New* German, compared, not only with the Old High German, but with the Mœso-Gothic. An extract from Mr. Hallam shall close the present section and introduce the next.

"Nothing can be more difficult, except by an arbitrary line, than to determine the commencement of the English language: not so much, as in those on the Continent, because we are in want of materials, but rather from an opposite reason, the possibility of showing a very gradual succession of verbal changes that ended in a change of denomination. We should probably experience a similar difficulty, if we knew equally well the current idiom of France or Italy in the seventh and eighth centuries. For when we compare the earliest English of the thirteenth century with the Anglo-Saxon of the twelfth, it seems hard to pronounce why it should pass for a separate language, rather than a modification or simplification of the former. We must conform, however, to usage, and say that the Anglo-Saxon was converted into English:—1. By contracting and otherwise modifying the pronunciation and orthography of words. 2. By omitting many inflections, especially of the Noun, and consequently making more use of Articles and Auxiliaries. 3. By the introduction of French Derivatives. 4. By using less inversion and ellipsis, especially in poetry. Of these, the second alone, I think, can be considered as sufficient to describe a new form of language; and this was brought about so gradually, that we are not relieved from much of our difficulty, as to whether some compositions shall pass for the latest offspring of the mother, or the earlier fruits of the daughter's fertility. It is a proof of this difficulty that the best masters of our ancient language have lately introduced the word Semi-Saxon, which is to cover everything from A. D. 1150 to A. D. 1250."—Chapter i. 47.

§ 35. At a given period, then, the Anglo-Saxon of the standard, and (if the expression may be used) classical authors, such as Cædmon, Alfred, Ælfric, &c. &c. had undergone such a change as to induce the scholars of the present age to denominate it, not Saxon, but *Semi*-Saxon. It had ceased to be genuine Saxon, but had not yet become English. In certain parts of the kingdom where the mode of speech changed more rapidly than elsewhere, the Semi-Saxon stage of our language came earlier. It was, as it were, precipitated.

The History of King Leir and his Daughters is found in two forms. Between these there is a difference either of dialect or of date, and possibly of both. Each, however, is Semi-Saxon. The extracts are made from Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica, p. 143.

Bladud hafde ene sune,	Bladud hadde one sone,
Leir was ihaten ;	Leir was ihote,
Efter his fader daie,	After his fader he held þis lond,
He heold þis drihlice lond,	In his owene hond,
Somed an his live,	Ilaste his lif-dages,
Sixti winter.	Sixti winter.
He makade ane riche burh,	He makede on riche borh,
þurh radfulle his crafte,	þorh wisemenne reade,
And he heo lette nemnen,	And hine lette nemni,
Efter him seolvan ;	After him scolve ;
Kaer-Leir hehte þe burh.	Kair-Leir hehte þe borh.
Leof heo wes þan kinge,	Leof he was þan kinge ;
þa we, an ure leod-quide,	þe we, on ure speche,
Leir-chestre clepiad,	Leþ-chestre cleopieþ,
Geare a þan holde dawon.	In þan colde daiye.

The Grave, a poetical fragment, the latter part of the Saxon Chronicle, a Homily for St. Edmund's Day (given in the Analecta), and above all, the printed extracts of the poem of Layamon, are the more accessible specimens of the Semi-Saxon. The Ormulum, although in many points

English rather than Saxon, retains the Dual Number of the Anglo-Saxon Pronouns. However, lest too much stress be laid upon this circumstance, the epistolary character of the Ormulum must be borne in mind.

It is very evident that if, even in the present day, there were spoken in some remote district the language of Alfred and Ælfric, such a mode of speech would he called, not Modern English, but Anglo-Saxon. This teaches us that the stage of language is to be measured, not by its date, but by its structure. Hence, Saxon ends and Semi-Saxon begins, not at a given year A. D., but at that time (whenever it be) when certain grammatical Inflections disappear, and certain characters of a more advanced stage are introduced.

Some, amongst others, of the earlier changes of the standard Anglo-Saxon are

1. The substitution of *an* for *as*, in the Plural of Substantives, as *Munucan* for *Munucas* (monks); and, conversely, the substitution of *-s* for *-n*, as *Steorres* for *Steorran* (stars). The use of *-s*, as the sign of the Plural, without respect to Gender, or Declension, may be one of those changes that the Norman Conquest forwarded; *-s* being the sign of the Plural in Anglo-Norman.

2. The ejection or shortening of final Vowels, *þæt ylc* for *þæt ylce*; *Sone* for *Sunu*; *Name* for *Nama*; *Dages* for *Dagas*.

3. The substitution of *-n* for *-m* in the Dative Case, *Hwilon* for *Hwilum*.

4. The ejection of the *-n* of the Infinitive Mood, *cumme* for *Cuman* (*to Come*); *Nemne* for *Nemnen* (*to Name*).

5. The ejection of *en* in the Participle Passive, *I-hote* for *Gehaten* (*called, hight*).

6. The Gerundial Termination *enne*, superseded by the Infinitive Termination *en*; as *to Lufian* for *to Lufienne*, or *Lufigenne*.

7. The substitution of *en* for *að* in the Persons Plural of Verbs; *Hi clepen* (*they call*) for *Hi clypiað*, &c. &c.

The preponderance (not the occasional occurrence) of forms like those above constitute Semi-Saxon in contradistinction to Standard Saxon, Classical Saxon, or Anglo-Saxon Proper.

§ 36. *Old English Stage.* — Further changes convert Semi-Saxon into Old English. Some, amongst others, are the following: —

1. The ejection of the Dative Plural Termination *-um*, and the substitution of the Preposition *to* and the Plural sign *s*; as *To Smiths* for *Smiðum*. Of the Dative Singular the *e* is retained (*ende*, *worde*); but it is by no means certain that, although recognized in writing, it was recognized in pronunciation also.

2. The ejection of *es* in the Genitive Singular whenever the Preposition *of* came before it; *Godes Love* (*God's Love*), but the *Love of God*, and not the *Love of Godes*.

3. The syllable *es* as a sign of the Genitive Case extended to all Genders and to all Declensions; *Heart's* for *Heortan*; *Sun's* for *Sunnan*.

4. The same in respect to the Plural Number; *Sterres* for *Steorran*; *Sons* for *Suna*.

5. The ejection of *-na* in the Genitive Plural; as *of Tunges'* for *Tungena*.

6. The use of the word *The*, as an Article, instead of *Se*, &c. &c. &c.

The preponderance of the forms above (and not their occasional occurrence) constitutes Old English in contradistinction to Semi-Saxon.

The following extract from Henry's History (Vol. viii. Append. iv.) is the proclamation of Henry III. to the people of Huntingdonshire, A. D. 1258. It currently passes for the earliest specimen of English.

" Henry, thurg Godes fultome, King on Engleneloande, lhoaurd on Yrloand, Duke on Normand, on Acquitain, Eorl on Anjou, send I greting, to alle hise holde, ilærde & ilewerde on Huntingdonschiere.

" That witen ge well alle, thæt we willen & unnen (grant) thæt ure rædesmen alle other, the moare del of heom, thæt beoth ichosen thurg us and thurg thæt loandes-folk on ure Kuneriche, habbith idon, and schullen don, in the worthnes of God, and ure threowthe, for the freme of the loande, thurg the besigte of than toforen iseide rædesmen, beo stedfæst and ilestinde in alle thinge abutan ænde, and we heaten alle ure treowe, in the treowthe thæt heo us ogen, thet heo stede-feslliche healden & weren to healden & to swerien the isetnesses thet beon makede and beo to makien, thurg than toforen iseide rædesmen, other thurg the moare del of heom alswo, alse hit is before iseide. And thet æhcother helpe thet for to done bitham ilche other, aganes alle men in alle thet heo ogt for to done, and to foangen. And noan ne of mine loande, ne of egetewhere, thurg this besigte, muge beon ilet other iwersed on oniewise. And gif oni ether onie cunnen her ongenes, we willen & heaten, thæt alle ure treowe heom healden deadlichistan. And for thæt we willen thæt this beo stædfast and lestinde, we senden gew this writ open, iseined with ure seel, to halden amanges gew ine hord. Witnes us-selven æt Lundæn, thæne egetetenthe day on the monthe of Octobr, in the two and fowertigthe geare of ure crunning."

The Songs amongst the Political Verses printed by the Camden Society, the Romance of Havelok the Dane, William and the Werwolf, the Gestes of Alisaundre, King Horn, Ipomedon, and the King of Tars; and, amongst the longer works, Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, and the Poems of Robert of Bourn (Brunn), are (amongst others) Old English. Broadly speaking, the *Old* English may be said to begin with the reign of Henry III, and to end with that of Edward III.

In the Old English the following forms predominate.

1. A fuller inflection of the Demonstrative Pronoun, or Definite Article; *þan, þenne, þære, þam;* — in contradistinction to the Middle English.

2. The presence of the Dative Singular in *-e; Ende, Smithe;—Ditto.*

3. The existence of a Genitive Plural in *-r* or *-ra;*

Heora, Theirs; *Aller*, of all;—*Ditto*. This with Substantives and Adjectives is less common.

4. The substitution of *Heo* for *They*, of *Heora* for *Their*, of *Hem* for *Them*; — in contradistinction to the later stages of English, and in contradistinction to old Lowland *Scotch*. (See Chapter VI.)

5. A more frequent use of *Min* and *Thin*, for *My* and *Thy*; — in contradistinction to Middle and Modern English.

6. The use of *Heo* for *She*; — in contradistinction to Middle and Modern English and Old Lowland *Scotch*.

7. The use of broader vowels; as in *iclepud* or *iclepod* (for *icleped* or *yclept*); *geongost*, youngest; *ascode*, asked; *eldore*, elder.

8. The use of the Strong Preterits (*See* the Chapter on the Tenses of Verbs), where in the present English the Weak form is found; *Wex*, *Wop*, *Dalf*, for *Waxed*, *Wept*, *Delved*.

9. The omission not only of the Gerundial termination *-enne*, but also of the Infinitive sign *-en* after *to*; *To honte*, *To speke*; — in contradistinction to Semi-Saxon.

10. The substitution of *-en* for *-eþ* or *-eð*, in the First and Second Persons Plural of Verbs; *We wollen*, We will; *Heo Schullen*, They should; — in contradistinction to Semi-Saxon.

11. The comparative absence of the Articles *Se* and *Seo*; —*Ditto*.

12. The substitution of *Ben* and *Beeth*, for *Synd* and *Syndon* = *We*, *Ye*, *They are*;—*Ditto*.

§ 37. The degree to which the Anglo-Saxon was actually influenced by the Anglo-Norman was noticed in § 34. The degree wherein the two languages came in contact is, plainly, another consideration. The first is the question, How far one of two languages influenced the other? The second asks, How far one of two languages had the op-

portunity of influencing the other? Concerning the extent to which the Anglo-Norman was used, I retail the following statements and quotations.

1. "Letters even of a private nature were written in Latin till the beginning of the reign of Edward I, soon after 1270, when a sudden change brought in the use of French."—*Mr. Hallam, communicated by Mr. Stevenson (Literature of Europe, I. 52, and note).*

2. Conversation between the Members of the Universities was ordered to be carried on either in Latin or French:—"*Si qua inter se proferant, colloquio Latino vel saltem Gallico perfruantur.*"—*Statutes of Oriel College, Oxford.—Hallam, ibid.* from Warton.

3. "The Minutes of the Corporation of London, recorded in the Town Clerk's Office, were in French, as well as the Proceedings in Parliament, and in the Courts of Justice."—*Ibid.*

4. "In Grammar Schools, boys were made to construe their Latin into French."—*Ibid.* "*Pueri in scholis, contra morem cæterarum nationum, et Normannorum adventu, derelicto proprio vulgari, construere Gallice compelluntur. Item quod filii Nobilium ab ipsis cunabulorum crepundiis ad Gallicum idioma informantur. Quibus profecto rurales homines assimulari volentes, ut per hoc spectabiliores videantur, Francigenari satagunt omni nisu.*"—*Higden (Ed. Gale,* p. 210).

That there was French in England before the battle of Hastings was stated in § 20, on the authority of Camden:—

"Herein is a notable argument of our ancestors' steadfastness in esteeming and retaining their own tongue. For, as *before the Conquest,* they misliked nothing more in King Edward the Confessor, than that he was Frenchified, and accounted the desire of a foreign language then to be a foretoken of the bringing in of foreign powers, which indeed happened."—*Remains,* p. 30.

§ 38. In Chaucer and Mandeville, and perhaps in all the writers of the reign of Edward III, we have a transition from the Old to the Middle English. The last characteristic of a Grammar different from that of the present English, is the Plural form in *-en; We tellen, Ye tellen, They tellen.* As this disappears, which it does in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, (Spenser has it continually,) the Middle

English may be said to pass into the New or Modern English.

§ 39. The *present* tendencies of the English may be determined by observation; and as most of them will be noticed in the Etymological part of this Volume, the few here indicated must be looked upon as illustrations only.

1. The distinction between the Subjunctive and Indicative Mood is likely to pass away. We verify this by the very general tendency to say *If it is*, and *If he speaks*, for *If it be*, and *If he speak*.

2. The distinction (as far as it goes) between the Participle Passive and the Past Tense is likely to pass away. We verify this by the tendency to say *It is broke*, and *He is smote*, for *It is broken*, and *He is smitten*.

3. Of the double forms, *Sung* and *Sang*, *Drank* and *Drunk*, &c. &c. one only will be the permanent.

As stated above, these tendencies are a few out of a number, and have been adduced in order to indicate the subject rather than to exhaust it.

§ 40. What the present language of England would have been had the Norman Conquest never taken place, the analogy of Holland, Denmark, and of many other countries enables us to determine. It would have been much as it is at present. What it would have been had the *Saxon* Conquest never taken place, is a question wherein there is far more speculation. Of France, of Italy, of Wallachia, and of the Spanish Peninsula, the analogies all point the same way. They indicate that the original Celtic would have been superseded by the Latin of the Conquerors, and consequently that our language in its later stages would have been neither British nor Gaelic, but Roman. Upon these analogies, however, we may refine. Italy, was from the beginning, Roman; the Spanish Peninsula was invaded full early; no ocean divided Gaul from Rome; and the war

against the ancestors of the Wallachians was a war of extermination.

§ 41. In *Lambkin* and *Lancet* the final syllables (*-kin* and *-et*) have the same power. They both express the idea of smallness or diminutiveness. These words are but two out of a multitude, the one (*Lamb*) being of Saxon, the other (*Lance*) of Norman origin. The same is the case with the superadded syllables: *-kin* is Saxon; *-et* Norman. Now to add a Saxon termination to a Norman word, or *vice versâ*, is to corrupt the English language. For this reason, however much it may be believed that the influence of the Norman Conquest upon our language has been over-valued, it must always be remembered that in the English there are two elements, a Gothic element (in the Anglo-Saxon), and a Classical element (in the Anglo-Norman, Latin, and Greek).

CHAPTER V.

ON THE DIALECTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 42. "In certain parts of the kingdom, where the "modes of speech changed more rapidly than elsewhere, "the Semi-Saxon stage of our language came earlier. It "was, as it were, precipitated." In these words, taken from § 35, a distinction was foreshadowed that will now be exhibited more conspicuously.

The word *Old*, as applied to language, has a double meaning.

The language of the United States was imported from England into America in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The language of South Australia has been introduced within the present generation. In one sense, the American English is older than the Australian. It was earliest separated from the mother-tongue.

The language, however, of America may, (I speak only in the way of illustration, and consequently hypothetically,) in the course of time, become the least old of the two; the word *old* being taken in another sense. It may change with greater rapidity. It may lose its Inflections. It may depart more from the structure of the mother-tongue, and preserve fewer of its *old* elements. In this sense the Australian (provided that it has altered least, and that it retain the greatest number of the *old* Inflections,) is the oldest tongue of the two.

Now what may be said of the language of two countries, may be said of the dialects of two districts. The one dialect may run its changes apace; the other alter but by degrees. Hence, of two works in two such dialects, the one would appear older than the other, although in reality the two were cotemporary.

§ 43. In no language is the necessity of this distinction more imperative than it is in English. The best Anglo-Saxons are the most aware that, before our early writings can be disposed according to their *time*, they must be arranged according to the *place* of their composition. This circumstance gives an importance to the study of our local dialects, which otherwise, in the eyes of the general student, it would not possess.

An additional reason for the study of our local dialects is collected from the following quotations. The first is from the Saxon Chronicle, A. D. 449; the second from Higden's Polychronicon. The first is taken more immediately from Rask's Preface to his Anglo-Saxon Grammar; the second from an article in the Quarterly Review of February 1816.

" Of Iótum comon Cantware and
" Wihtware, þæt is seo mæið, þe
" nú eardað on Wiht, and þæt
" cynn on West-Sexum, ðe man
" gyt hæ't Iútnacynn. Of Eald-
" Seaxum comon Eást-Seaxan and
" Suð-Seaxan, and West-Seaxan.
" Of Angle comon (se á siððan
" stód westig betwix Iútum and
" Seaxum) Eást-Engle, Middel-
" Angle, Mearce, and ealle Norð-
" ymbra."

From the Jutes came the inhabitants of Kent and of Wight, that is, the race that now dwells in Wight, and that tribe amongst the West-Saxons, which is yet called the Jute tribe. From the Old-Saxons came the East-Saxons, and South-Saxons, and West-Saxons. From the Angles Land (which has since always stood waste betwixt the Jutes and Saxons) came the East-Angles, Middle-Angles, Mercians, and all the Northumbrians.

Angli quoque, quamquam ab initio tripartitam sortirentur Linguam, Austrinam, et Mediterraneam et Borealem, veluti ex tribus Germaniæ

populis procedentes, ex commixtione tamen primo cum Danis, deinde cum Normannis, corrupta in multis propria Lingua, peregrinos jam captant boatus et garritus.—(*Ed. Gal*, p. 210.)

Here we have indicated, not the question What tribes peopled Britain? but the question, How were the tribes distributed? In such a question the historian gives us *external*, the local dialects *internal* evidence.

§ 44. Of the Jutes we seek traces, if anywhere, in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight; of the Frisians, in Kent; of the Saxons, in Berks, Wilts, and Somerset; of the Angles, in Norfolk and Suffolk; of the Scandinavians, in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, and Northumberland.

That Celtic words should most readily be found in districts (like Cornwall) where a Celtic language was most lately spoken is what we expect, and what we find. That foreign colonies, large or small, should leave their traces in the localities where they were situated, is neither impossible nor improbable.

The following are notices of certain localities which may or may not retain dialectal peculiarities.

I. Cumberland and the district of Strath-Clyde. The Celtic of Wales was spoken North of its present boundaries. Subsequent (?) to the Conquest, it was the language of the North-west of England, and of the South-west of Scotland. On the North, it came in contact with the Scotch Gaelic; on the East, with the dialects of South Scotland and Northumberland.

II. Cornwall and Devonshire; for traces of the Celtic of Cornwall, spoken in that county within a century.

III. Galloway, the Lothians, and the whole line of the wall of Severus. This was the locality of the Picts, upon which Higden has the following remark:—"*Scoti* —— *utpote cum aliis nationibus impermixti, ad purum pene pristinum retinent idioma, nisi forsan ex convictu Pictorum, cum*

quibus olim confederati cohabitaverunt, quippiam contraxerint in sermone."

IV. The neighbourhood of Melrose, in Scotland.

V. The neighbourhood of Haverfordwest, in Wales. In each of these places was introduced, in the reign of Henry I, a colony of Flemings. "*Sed et Flandrenses, tempore Regis Henrici Primi in magna copia juxta Mailros ad Orientalem Angliæ plagam habitationem pro tempore accipientes, septimam in Insula gentem fecerunt: jubente tamen eodem Rege, ad Occidentalem Walliæ partem, apud Haner-ford, sunt translati. Sicque Britannia —— his —— nationibus habitatur in præsenti —— Flandrensibus in West Wallia.*"

A little below, however, we learn that these Flemings are distinguished by their origin only, and not by their language:—"*Flandrenses vero qui in Occidua Walliæ incolunt, dimissa jam barbarie, Saxonice satis loquuntur.*"—Higden, Edit. Gale, p. 210.

VI. *The County Wexford*.—I have read that in the Irish County Wexford we may look for a very peculiar English dialect. In the reign of Richard II. there was transplanted thither a number of English families. These families still keep themselves distinct from the Irish Gaels, and they preserve their language as it was spoken in the time of Chaucer. For this statement, drawn from a periodical work, whose title I do not at present remember, the authority of Camden is given.

§ 45. My own limited researches in our dialects have all been made with one object; *viz.* that of determining the amount of direct Scandinavian (§ 18), not in the standard, but in the provincial English. In doing this, there is the difficult task of proving a negative. There are plenty of words which are Scandinavian. The profounder Saxon scholar shows them, however, to be Germanic as well.

The peculiar distribution of the Scottish Gaelic indicates a distinction between the Scandinavian of the North of Scotland and the Scandinavian of the East of England. The Lowland Scotch recedes as we go northward. Notwithstanding this, it is not the extreme North that is most Gaelic. In Caithness the geographical names are Norse. *Sutherland*, the most northern county of Scotland, takes its name from being *South;* that is, of Norway. The Orkneys and Shetland are in name, manners, and language, Norse or Scandinavian. The Hebrides are Gaelic mixed with Scandinavian. The Isle of Man is the same. The word *Sodor* (in Sodor and Man) is Norse, with the same meaning as it has in *Sutherland*. All this indicates a more preponderating, and an earlier infusion of Norse along the coast of Scotland, than that which took place under the Danes upon the coasts of England, in the days of Alfred and under the reign of Canute. The first may, moreover, have this additional peculiarity, *viz.* of being Norwegian rather than Danish. To this distinction reference will be made in the next Chapter.

§ 46. The following section exhibits not so much the characters of our dialects as the transition of letters (*see* § 6). It is illustrative of this, rather than exhaustive of our dialectal peculiarities.

Of the Saxon dialects I know only the little that may be collected from the printed specimens. However, the Northumbrian Glosses preserve the following northern forms; and these coincide with the present peculiarities of the North of England dialects.

O for *a* — as *Hond, lond, mon,* for *hand, land, man.*

Œ for *é* — as *Woeg, foerde,* for *wég, fĕrde.*

Uo for *o* — as *Cuom, cuomon,* for *com, comen.*

S for ð, in the Plural of Verbs — as *Gearwas, cymes, gelefes,* for *gegearwað, cymð, gelefað.*

S for *se* — as *Salde* for *sealde*. This is found also in the Raskanthian Glosses, preserving the Saxon of Yorkshire, and coinciding in most other points with the Northumbrian.

In the Natale St. Eadmundi, in Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica, which is called Semi-Saxon, the substitution of *æ* for *e*, as *gearæ* for *geare*, &c. &c. seems to be a mere point of orthography. As in the Northumbrian, *o* is found in the place of *a* (*lond*, *land*). In the language of a Will (from the same work), the omission of the final *d* (*gol*, for *gold*) occurs.

The Will and the *Natale* are in the dialect of Norfolk and Suffolk.

The following specimen (taken from Bosworth) of what is called the English of Kent in A. D. 1340, seems to me Old English rather than Semi-Saxon.

Nou ich wille þet ye ywyte hou hit is ywent ;
þet þis boc is ywrite mi*d* Engliss of Kent.
þis boc is ymad *u*or lewede men,
*V*or ua*d*er and *u*or mo*d*er, and uor oþer ken.
Hem *u*or to berze uram alle manyere zen ;
þet inc hare inwytte ne bleue no *u*ord wen.
Huo as god is his name yzed,
þet þis boc made God him yeue þet bread.
Of Angles of heuene and þerto his red,
And onder*u*onge his zaule huanne
þet he is dÿad.
Amen.

Ymende. þet þis boc is uolueld ine þe eue of þe holy apostles Symond an Judas, of ane broþer of þe chorjstre of Saynt Austin of Canterberi. Ine þe yeare of oure lhordes beringe 1340.

The dialectal differences are shown by the italics. Here, in the English of Kent, we have *d* for ð and *s* for *sh*, as in the North; and *z* and *v* for *s* and *f*, as in Devonshire.

The language of Layamon, of Havelok the Dane, of

Robert of Gloucester, of Wycliffe, of the Ormulum, and of many other standard authors, in a degree savours of its locality; that of the first belonging to the banks of the Severn, of the second to Lincolnshire, of the third to Gloucestershire, of the fourth to Durham; whilst the birth-place of the author of the Ormulum is undetermined.

The earlier the stage of a language, the more will even the learned who write in it carry in their style peculiarities of dialect.

In the Townley Mysteries, especially in the *Mactacio Abel*, and the *Secunda Pastorum*, we have the provincialisms of the West-Riding of Yorkshire in the Middle English.

In Chaucer* we have a partial imitation of the Yorkshire dialect. This indicates a class of writings which, in the critical history of our local dialects, must be used with great caution and address. An imitation of dialect may be so lax as to let its only merit consist in a deviation from the standard idiom.

In the Lear of Shakspeare we have speeches from a Kentish clown. Is this the dialect of the character, the dialect of the writer, or is it some conventional dialect appropriated to theatrical purposes? I think the latter.

In Ben Jonson's Tale of a Tub, one (and more than one of the characters) speaks thus. His residence is the neighbourhood of London, Tottenham Court.

> Is it no sand? nor buttermilk? if 't be,
> Ich 'am no zive, or watering-pot, to draw
> Knots in your 'casions. If you trust me, zo —
> If not, *pra*forme 't your zelves. 'Cham no man's wife,
> But resolute Hilts: you 'll vind me in the Buttry.
>
> *Act* I. *Scene* 1.

* See Quarterly Review, Feb. 1836.

I consider that this represents the dialect of the neighbourhood of London, not on the strength of its being put in the mouth of a man of Tottenham, but from the circumstance of its coinciding with the Kentish specimen of § 46.

Not so, however, with the provincialisms of another of Ben Jonson's plays, the Sad Shepherd:—

——— shew your sell
Tu all the sheepards, bauldly ; gaing amang hem.
Be mickle in their eye, frequent and fugeand.
And, gif they ask ye of Eiarine,
Or of these claithes ; say that I ga' hem ye,
And say no more. I ha' that wark in hand,
That web upon the luime, sall gar hem thinke.

Act II. *Scene* 3.

The scene of the play is Sherwood Forest: the language, however, as far as I may venture an opinion, is not the language from which the present Nottinghamshire dialect has come down.

It is a lax expression to say that it is the old forms (the archaisms) that the provincial dialects retain. The provincial forms are archaic only when the current language changes more rapidly than the local idiom. When the local idiom changes fastest, the archaic forms belong to the standard mode of speech.

The provincial forms, *goand*, *slepand*, for *going* and *sleeping*, are archaic. Here the archaism is with the provincial form.

The forms, *almost*, *horses*, *nought but*, contrasted with the provincialisms *ommost*, *hosses*, *nobbot*, are archaic. They have not been changed so much as they will be. Here the archaism (that is, the nearer approach to the oldest form) is with the standard idiom. A sequestered locality is preservative of old forms. But writing and education are preservatives of them also.

In the way of grammar we find in our provincial dialects (amongst many others) the following old forms.

1. An Infinitive form in *ie;* as *to sowie, to reapie,*— Wiltshire. (Mr. Guest.)

2. The Participial form in *and;* as *goand, sleepand* (vid. sup.),—Lincolnshire, Northumberland, Scotland.

3. The common use of the termination *th* in the Third Person Present; *goeth, hath, speaketh,* — Devonshire.

4. Plural forms in *-en;* as *housen,* — Leicestershire and elsewhere.

5. Old Preterit forms of certain Verbs; as,

Clomb,	from	*climb,*	Hereford and elsewhere.
Hove,	—	*heave,*	ditto.
Puck,	—	*pick,*	ditto.
Shuck,	—	*shook,*	ditto.
Squoze,	—	*squeeze,*	ditto.
Sew,	—	*sow,*	Essex.
Rep,	—	*reap,*	ditto.
Mew,	—	*mow,*	ditto, &c. &c.

The following changes (a few out of many) are matters not of Grammar, but of Pronunciation.

Ui for *oo* — *Cuil, bluid,* for *cool, blood,* — Cumberland, Scotland.

Oy for *i* — *Foyne, twoyne,* for *fine, twine,* — Cheshire, Cambridgeshire, Suffolk.

Oy for *oo* — *Foyt* for *foot,* — Halifax.

Oy for *o* — *Noite, foil, coil, hoil,* for *note, foal, coal, hole,* — Halifax.

Oy for *a* — *Loyne* for *lane,* — Halifax.

Ooy for *oo* — *Nooin, gooise, fooil, tooil,* for *noon, goose, fool, tool,* — Halifax.

W inserted (with or without a modification)—as *Spwort, scworn, whoam,* for *sport, scorn, home,* — Cumberland, West Riding of Yorkshire.

Ew for *oo*, or *yoo* — *Tewn* for *tune*, — Suffolk, Westmoreland.

Iv for *oo*, or *yoo* when a Vowel follows — as *Samivel* for *Samuel; Emmanivel* for *Emmanuel.* In all these we have seen a tendency to *Diphthongal* sounds.

In the following instances the practice is reversed, and instead of the Vowel being made a Diphthong, the Diphthong becomes a Vowel, as,

O for *oy* — *Boh* for *boy*, — Suffolk, &c.

Oo for *ow* — *Broon* for *brown*, — Bilsdale.

Ee for *i* — *Neet* for *night*, — Cheshire.

O for *ou* — *bawn'* for *bound*, — Westmoreland.

Of these the substitution of *oo* for *ow*, and of *ee* for *i*, are of importance in the questions of Appendix B.

Ēē for *a* — *Theere* for *there*, — Cumberland.

Ēē for *ĕ* — *Reed, seeven*, for *red, seven*, — Cumberland, Craven.

Ā for *ō* — *Sair, mair, baith*, for *sore, more, both*, — Cumberland, Scotland.

A˘ for *ŏ* — *Saft* for *soft*, — Cheshire.

Ŏ for *ă* — *Mon* for *man*, — Cheshire. *Lond* for *land*, — East-Anglian Semi-Saxon.

Y inserted before a Vowel — *Styake, ryape*, for *stake, rope*, — Borrowdale; especially after *g* (a point to be noticed); *gyarden, gyown*, for *garden, gown*,—Warwickshire, &c. &c.; and at the beginning of a word, as *yat, yan*, for *ate, one* (*ane*), — Westmoreland, Bilsdale.

H inserted — *Hafter, hoppen*, for *after, open*, —Westmoreland, &c. &c.

H omitted — *At, ard*, for *hat, hard*, — *Passim.*

Transition of Consonants.

B for *v* — *Whitehebbon* for *Whitehaven*, — Borrowdale.

P for *b* — *Poat* for *boat.* — Welsh pronunciation of many English words. See the speeches of Sir Hugh Evans in Merry Wives of Windsor.

V for *f* — *Vind* for *find*, — characteristic of Devonshire, Kent. See § 46.

T for *d* (final) — *Deet* for *deed*, — Borrowdale.

T for *ch* (*tsh*) — *Fet* for *fetch*, — Devonshire.

D for *j* (*dzh*) — *Sled* for *sledge*, — Hereford.

D for *th* (þ) — *Wid*, *with*; *tudder*, *the other*, — Borrowdale, Westmoreland. Initial (especially before a Consonant) — *Drash*, *Droo* = *Thrash*, *Through*, — Devonshire, Wilts.

K for *ch* (*tsh*) — *Thack*, *pick*, for *thatch*, *pitch*, — Westmoreland, Lincolnshire, Halifax.

G for *j* (*dzh*) — *Brig* for *bridge*, — Lincolnshire, Hereford.

G preserved from the Anglo-Saxon — *Lig*, *lie.* Anglo-Saxon, *Licgar*, — Lincolnshire, North of England.

Z for *s* — *Zee* for *see*, — Devonshire.

S for *sh* — *Sall* for *shall*, — Craven, Scotland.

Y for *g* — *Yet* for *gate*, — Yorkshire, Scotland.

W for *v* — *Wiew* for *view*, — Essex, London.

N for *ng* — *Bleedin* for *bleeding*, — Cumberland, Scotland.

Sk for *sh* — *Busk* for *bush*, — Halifax.

Ejection of Letters.

K before *s*, the preceding Vowel being lengthened by way of compensation — *Neist* for *next*, *seist* for *sixth*, — Halifax.

D and *v* after a Consonant — *Gol* for *gold*, *siller* for *silver*, — Suffolk. The ejection of *f* is rarer; *mysel* for *myself*, however, occurs in most dialects.

L final, after a short Vowel, in which case the Vowel is lengthened — *Poo* for *pull*, — Cheshire, Scotland.

Al changed to *a* open — *Haaf* for *half*, *saumon* for *salmon*, — Cumberland.

Transposition.

Transpositions of the liquid *r* are common in all our provincial dialects; as *gars*, *brid*, *perty*, for *grass*, *bird*, *pretty*. Here the provincial forms are the oldest, *gærs*, *brid*, &c. &c. being the Anglo-Saxon forms.

§ 47. Of the Gypsy language I need only say that it is not only Indo-Germanic, but that it is Hindoo. We can even state the particular district (Moultan) of India where it was spoken. Of Coptic, Bohemian, or Wallachian, I am not aware that it contains any traces. Neither have any words from it mixed themselves with our standard (or even our provincial) dialects.

Thieves' language, or that dialect for which there is no name, but one from its own vocabulary, viz. slang, is of greater value in philology than in commerce. It serves to show that in speech nothing is arbitrary. Its compound phrases are either periphrastic or metaphorical; its simple monosyllables are generally those of the current language in an older form. The thieves of London are conservators of Anglo-Saxonisms. In this dialect I know of no specimens earlier than the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In the dramatic literature of that age they are rife and common. The Roaring Girl, the Jolly Beggars, amongst the plays, and Deckar's Bellman amongst the tracts, preserve us a copious vocabulary, similar to what we have now, and similar to what it was in Gay's time. Of this the greater part is Saxon. Here and there appears a word of Latin origin, *e.g. Pannum*, Bread; *Cassons*, Cheese. Of the Gypsy language I have discovered no trace.

The Talkee-Talkee is a Lingua Franca based on the English, and spoken by the Negroes of Surinam. Specimens of this, from a Gospel for the use of the Guiana

slaves, may be seen in the 86th Number of the Quarterly Review. The book itself is rare.

That the Anglo-Norman of England was, in the reign of Edward III, not the French of Paris, (and most probably not the Franco-Norman of Normandy,) we learn from the well-known quotation from Chaucer:—

> And Frenche she spake ful feteously,
> After the scole of Stratforde at Bowe,
> For french of Parys was to her unknowe.
>
> *Prologue to the Canterbury Tales.*

§ 48. The concluding extract from the *Testamenta Eboracensia*, published by the Surtees Society, is from the will of a gentleman of Yorkshire. To me it seems to impugn the assertion of Higden, that the Norman was spoken throughout England without a variety of pronunciation: "Mirandum videtur quomodo nativa propria Anglorum "Lingua, in unica Insula coartata, pronunciatione ipsa fit "tam diversa, cum tamen Normannica Lingua, quæ ad-"venticia est, univoca maneat penes cunctos."

Ed. Gale, p. 210.

Testamenta Eboracensia, CLIX.

En le noune de Dieu, et de notre Dame Sante Marie, et en noun de teuz lez sauntez de Paradyse, Amen. Moi Brian de Stapylton devise m'alme a Dieu et a notre Dame Saunte Marie, et a touz lez Sauntz de Paradyse, et mon chautiff corps d'estre enterre en le Priourie de le Parke decoste ma compaigne, que Dieu l'assoille, et sur mon corps seit un drape de blew saye ; et ma volunte est au l'aide de Dieu d'avoire un herce ov synke tapirs, chescun tapir de synk livers, et tresze hommes vestuz en bluw ov tresze torchez, de queux tresze torchez, si ne saiount degastez, jeo voile que quatre demore a le dit Priorie.

Item jeo devyse que j'ay un homme armes en mes armes et ma hewme ene sa teste, et quy soit bien monte et un homme de bon entaille de qil condicon que y sort.

Item jeo devyse que touz ceaux, qui a moy appendent meignialx en ma maison, soient vestuz en bluw a mes costagez. Et a touz les poores

qils veignent le jour de mon enterment jeo devise et voile que chescun ait un denier en ovre de charrte, et en aide de ma chitiffe alme, et jeo voile que les sires mes compaignons mez aliez et mez voiseignez, qui vollionl venir de lour bone gre prier pour moy et pour faire honour a mon chettife corps, qi peue ne vault, jeo oille et chargez mez executour que y soient mesme cel jour bien a eise, et q'il eient a boiere asseth, et a cest ma volunté parfournir jeo devise ci marcæ ove l'estore de maison taunke juiste seit.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LOWLAND SCOTCH.

§ 49. Upon the subject of the present Chapter the theories concerning the Picts and the Belgæ (§ 53, 54,) have an especial bearing. So also have the contents of Chapter V. So also the remark that between a dialect and a language it is often difficult to draw a distinction.

Concerning the dialect, or language, popularly called the Lowland Scotch, the current opinions have been that, like the present English, it is derived from the Anglo-Saxon, and consequently introduced from the South. The marriage of Malcolm Canmor with an English Princess, the intercourse between the Scots of the South and the English of the North, and, finally, the emigration of English families into Scotland, have each, severally or collectively, been put forward as the immediate causes of the introduction of the English language into Scotland. With these, however, many of the later Etymologists have been dissatisfied.

To their own satisfaction, and, in a certain degree, to the satisfaction of others, they have shown as follows: — 1. That there are in Lowland Scotch a number of words which, although Teutonic, were never Anglo-Saxon; 2. That of the numerous Scottish Gallicisms, a large portion were introduced *directly* from France; 3. That the causes adduced are insufficient to effect the change

in point; and 4. That so far from the Lowland Scotch being a mere dialect of the English, it has all the qualities of a regular and cultivated language. Hence the conclusion that the Scottish is no daughter of the Anglo-Saxon, but a sister; no derived language, but a parallel one.

To account for this, it is stated that the present Scottish is derived from the Pictish, and that the Picts were of Gothic (Scandinavian) origin. The reasoning upon these matters is to be found in the Dissertation upon the Origin of the Scottish Language prefixed to Jamieson's Etymological Dictionary.

Of the arguments there adduced, I coincide with one only, *viz.* the second; which is, that the causes currently brought forward are, I will not say insufficient, but unsatisfactory.

The stock to which the Picts and Belgæ belong, I hold to be undetermined.

The derivation of the names of the Pictish Kings is equally unsatisfactory, whether drawn from the Gothic or the Celtic.

That the Gothic (Scandinavian) names in the Landnamabog are also Scottish, is perfectly true; but it is also true that, amongst the *Gaelic* districts of Scotland, Scandinavian names are to be found. *Ivor* and *Ronald* (as in *M'Ivor*, and *Clan-Ronald*) are both Scandinavian; a circumstance indicated to me by a philological friend.

The third and fourth arguments involve two assertions: 1st. That the Orkneys were peopled by Scandinavians; and 2nd. That what is true concerning the Orkneys is true concerning the rest of Scotland.

Agreeing in the first statement, I take exceptions to the second.

The peculiar distribution of the English over the

Northern parts of Scotland has been noticed in Chapter V. The inference from it is as follows:—That the Scandinavians settled in the Northern parts of Scotland at an early period, but that it was a late period when they ravaged the Southern ones. Hence, though the language of Orkney may be Norse, that of the Lothians may be Saxon.

To verify these views, we want not a General Dictionary of the Scottish Language taken altogether, but a series of Local Glossaries, or at any rate a Vocabulary, 1st, of the Northern; 2ndly, of the Southern Scottish.

Between the English and Lowland Scotch we must account for the likeness as well as the difference. The Scandinavian theory accounts for the difference only.

§ 50. Of the following specimens of the Lowland Scotch, the first is from The Bruce, a poem written by Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, between the years 1360 and 1375; the second from Wyntoun, 1363; the third from Blind Harry's poem, The Bruce, 1460; and the fourth from Gawin Douglas's translation of the Æneid, A.D. 1513.

The Bruce, iv. 871—892.

And as he raid in to the nycht
So saw he, with the monys lycht,
Schynnyng off scheldys gret plenté;
And had wondre quhat it mycht be.
With that all hale thai gaiff a cry,
And he, that hard sa suddainly
Sic noyis, sumdele affrayit was.
Bot in schort time he till him tais
His spyrites full hardely;
For his gentill hart, and worthy,
Assurit hym in to that nede.
Then with the spuris he strak the sted,
And ruschyt in amaing them all.
The feyrst he met he gert him fall;
And syne his suord he swapyt out,
And roucht about him mony rout.

And slew sexsum weill sone and ma :
Then wndre him his horss thai sla :
And he fell ; but he smertty rass,
And strykand rowm about him mass :
And slew off thaim a quantité.
Bot woundyt wondre sar was he.

Wyntoun's Chronicle, I. xiii. 1—22.

Blessyde Bretayn Beelde sulde be
Of all þe Ilys in þe Se,
Quhare Flowrys are fele on Feldys fayre
Hale of hewe, haylsum of ayre.
Of all corne þare is copy gret,
Pese and A'tys, Bere and Qwhet :
Báth froyt on Tre, and fysche in flwde ;
And tyl all Catale pasture gwde.
Solynus Sayis, in Brettany
Sum steddys growys sá habowndanly
Of Gyrs, þat sum tym (but) þair Fe
Frá fwlth of Mete refrenyht be,
Đair fwde sall turne þam to peryle,
To rot, or bryst, or dey sum quhyle.
Đare wylde in Wode has welth at wille ;
Đare hyrdys hydys Holme and Hille :
Đare Bwyis bowys all for Byrtht,
Báthe Merle and Mawesys mellys for myrtht :
Đare huntyng is at all kyne Dere,
And rycht gud hawlkyn on Bÿwer ;
Of Fysche þaire is habowndance ;
And nedfulle thyng to Mannys substance.

Wallace, xi. 230—262.

A lord off court, quhen he approchyt thar,
Wnwisytly sperd, with outyn prouision ;
" Wallace, dar ye go feeht on our lioun ?"
And he said ; " Ya, so the King suffyr me ;
" Or on your selff, gyff ye ocht bettyr be."
Quhat will ye mar ? this thing amittyt was,
That Wallace suld on to the lioun pas.
The King thaim chargyt to bring him gud harnas :
Then he said ; " Nay, God scheild me fra sic cass.

" I wald tak weid, suld I fecht with a man ;
" But (for) a dog, that nocht off armes can,
" I will haiff nayn, bot synglar as I ga."
A gret manteill about his hand can ta,
And his gud suerd ; with him he tuk na mar ;
Abandounly in barrace entryt thar.
Gret chenys was wrocht in the yet with a gyn,
And pulld it to quhen Wallace was tharin.
The wod lyoun, on Wallace quhar he stud,
Rampand he braid, for he desyryt blud ;
With his rude pollis in the mantill rocht sa.
Aukwart the bak than Wallace can him ta,
With his gud suerd, that was off burnest steill,
His body in twa it thruschyt euirilkdeill.
Syn to the King he raykyt in gret ire,
And said on lowd ; " Was this all your desyr,
" To wayr a Scot thus lychtly in to wayn ?
" Is thar ma doggis at ye wald yeit haiff slayne ?
" Go, bryng thaim furth, sen I mon doggis qwell,
" To do byddyng, quhill that with thee duell.
" It gaynd full weill I graithit me to Scotland ;
" For grettar deidis thair men has apon hand,
" Than with a dog in battaill to escheiff —
" At you in France for euir I tak my leiff."

Gawin Douglas—Æn. II.

As Laocon that was Neptunus preist,
And chosin by cavil vnto that ilk office,
Ane fare grete bull offerit in sacrifice,
Solempnithe before the haly altere,
Throw the still sey from Tenedos in fere,
Lo twa gret lowpit edderis with mony thraw
First throw the flude towart the land can draw.
(My sprete abhorris this matter to declare)
Aboue the wattir thare hals stude euirmare,
With bludy creistis outwith the wallis hie,
The remanent swam always vnder the se,
With grisly bodyis lynkit mony fald,
The salt fame stouris from the fard they hald,
Unto the ground thay glade with glowand ene,
Stuffit full of venom, fire and felloun tene,

With tounges quhissling in thar mouthis red,
Thay lik the twynkilland stangis in thar hed.
We fled away al bludles for effere.
Bot with ane braide to Laocon in fere
Thay stert attanis, and his twa sonnys zyng
First athir serpent lappit like ane ring,
And with thare cruel bit, and stangis fell,
Of tender membris tuke mony sory morsel;
Syne thay the preist invadit baith twane,
Quhilk wyth his wappins did his besy pane
His childer for to helpen and reskew.
Bot thay about him lowpit in wympillis threw,
And twis circulit his myddel round about,
And twys faldit thare sprutillit skynnis but dout,
About his hals, baith neck and hed they nehent.
As he ettis thare hankis to haue rent,
And with his handis thaym away haue draw,
His hede bendis and garlandis all war blaw
Full of vennum and rank poysoun attanis,
Quhilk infekkis the flesche, blude, and banys.

§ 51. In the way of Orthography, the most characteristic difference between the English and Scotch is the use, on the part of the latter, of *qu* for *wh;* as *Quhen, Quhare, Quhat,* for *when, where, what.* The substitution of *sch* for *sh* (as *scho* for *she*), and of *z* for the Old English ȝ, (as *zour* for *ȝeowr, your,*) is as much Northern English as Scotch.

In pronunciation, the substitution of *d* for ð (if not a point of spelling), as in *fader* for *father;* of *a* for *o,* as *báith* for *both;* of *s* for *sh,* as *sall* for *shall;* and the use of the guttural sound of *ch,* as in *loch, nocht,* are the same.

The ejection of the *n* before *t,* or an allied sound, and the lengthening of the preceding Vowel, by way of compensation, as in *begouth* for *beginneth,* seems truly Scotch. It is the same change that in Greek turns the radical syllable ὀδοντ into ὀδοῦς.

The formation of the Plural of Verbs in *-s,* rather than

in *-th* (the Anglo-Saxon form), is Northern English as well as Scotch:—Scotch, *Slepys*, *Lovys;* Northern English, *Slepis*, *Lovis;* Old Eng. *Slepen*, *Loven;* A. S. *Slepiaŏ*, *Lufiaŏ*.

The formation of the Plural Number of the Genitive Case by the addition of the syllable *-is* (*blastis*, *birdis*, *bloomis*), instead of the letter -s (*blasts*, *birds*, *blooms*), carries with it a metrical advantage, inasmuch as it gives a greater number of double rhymes.

The same may be said of the Participal forms, *affrayit*, *assurit*, for *affrayd*, *assured*.

Concerning the comparative rate of change in the two languages no general assertion can be made. In the Scotch words, *sterand*, *slepand*, &c. &c. for *steering*, *sleeping*, the form is antiquated, and Anglo-Saxon rather than English. It is not so, however, with the words, *thai* (*they*), *thaim* (*them*), *thair* (*their*), compared with the contemporary words in English, *heo*, *hem*, *heora*. In these, it is the Scottish that is least, and the English that is most Anglo-Saxon.

§ 52. To these last-mentioned words I invoke the attention of my reader. As far as I am justified in making a negative assertion, the English forms, *heo* (either meaning *she* or *they*), *hire*, *hem*, are found neither in Barbour, Wyntoun, Blind Harry, nor Gawin Douglas. Once or twice I have found them in short poems, not unequivocally Scottish, and in the poem of Tristrem, attributed to Thomas the Rhymer, they occur, mixed with the truer and more Scottish forms, *Scho*, *Thai*, *Thaim*, *Thair*.

If the preceding sentence be true, we have in the words quoted an instrument of criticism. For one, amongst others, it invalidates the Scottish origin of Sir Tristrem, at least in its present form.

CHAPTER VII.

ON CERTAIN UNDETERMINED AND FICTITIOUS LANGUAGES OF GREAT BRITAIN.

§ 53. THE languages mentioned in the present Chapter claim their place on one ground only,—*they have been the subject of controversy.* The notice of them will be brief. The current texts upon which the controversies have turned will be quoted; whilst the opinion of the present writer is left to be collected from the title of the Chapter.

The Belgæ.) By some these are considered a Germanic rather than a Celtic tribe; the view being supported by the following extracts from Cæsar: — "*Gallia est omnis divisa in tres partes; quarum unam incolunt Belgæ, aliam Aquitani, tertiam, qui ipsorum lingua Celtæ, nostra Galli, appellantur. Hi omnes lingua institutis, legibus inter se differunt. Gallos—a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit.*"—B. G. i. "*Belgæ ab extremis Galliæ finibus oriuntur.*"— B. G. ii. "*Quum ab his quæreret, quæ civitates, quantæque in armis essent, et quid in bello possent, sic reperiebat: plerosque Belgas esse ortos a Germanis, Rhenumque antiquitùs transductos, propter loci fertilitatem ibi consedisse; Gallosque, qui ea loca incolerent, expulisse; solosque esse qui patrum nostrorum memoria, omni Gallia vexata Teutones Cimbrosque intra fines suos ingredi prohibuerunt.*" — B. G. ii. 4. "*Britanniæ pars Interior ab iis incolitur quos natos in insulâ ipsâ memoriâ proditum dicunt: maritima pars ab iis, qui*

prædæ ac belli inferendi causa ex Belgio transierant."—B. G. v. 12. From the Introduction to his Frisian Grammar, we find that Rask looked upon the Belgæ as Celts; and considered that one word, at least, from their language was surviving in the present Dutch.

§ 54. *The Picts*). Concerning the stock of the Pictish nation and language there is,

1st. The Celtic Theory.—This considers them to have been Celts; but without determining the branch to which they belonged.

2nd. The Gothic Theory.—This asserts of the Picts not only that they were Goths, but that they were Goths of the Scandinavian branch; and that they imported into Great Britain the languages of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. The bearings of these two hypotheses may be seen in the Chapter upon the Lowland Scotch.

3rd. The Cambrian Theory.—This is the view of the Irish, the others being those of the Scotch etymologists. It maintains that the Picts were *Welsh*, but although Welsh, not Celts.

Of these three hypotheses, it is the last only that I can venture (as I do most decidedly) to contradict.

That the Picts came from over sea is stated most explicitly by Nennius, whose evidence points to Scandinavia as their original seat:—"*Picti venerunt et occupaverunt insulas, quæ Orcades vocantur, et postea ex insulis affinitimis vastaverunt non modicas et multas regiones, occupaveruntque eas in sinistrali plaga Britanniæ, et manent usque in hodiemum diem. Ibi tertiam partem Britanniæ tenuerunt, et tenent usque nunc.*"—(Nennius, Ed. Gale. cap. v. p. 99.) Gildas calls the Picts *Transmarini;* but as the same adjective is applied to the Scots, his evidence (unless he means the Scots of Ireland) is unsatisfactory:—"*Duabus primum gentibus transmarinis, vehementer sævis, Scotorum a*

Circione, Pictorum ab Aquilone, calcabilis multos stupet gemetque per annos."—Ed. Gale. c. xi. p. 12.

Higden's statements are that they came "*De Scythia, longis navibus.*" Their King he names *Roderick*, a Gothic appellation.

The following quotation from Bede is confirmatory of the preceding ones:—"*Cum plurimam insulæ partem, incipientes ab Austro, possedissent* (*Britones*), *contigit gentem Pictorum de Scythia, ut perhibent, longis navibus non multis oceanum ingressam. Itaque petentes Britanniam Picti, habitare per Septentrionales insulæ partes cœperunt: nam Austrina Britones occupaverunt.*"—Bede, lib. i. 1. The same author speaks elsewhere to the distinctness of their language.

Wyntoun, a North-Briton, writing about A.D. 1363, speaks of them as a nation no longer existing.

Cronykil, i. xiii. 39.

Of Langagis in Bretayne sere
I fynd þat sum tym fyf þare were:
Of Brettys fyrst, and Inglis syne,
Peycht, and Scot, and syne Latyne.
Bot, of þe Peychtis, is ferly,
Đat ar wndon sá hálylyly,
Đat nowþir remanande ar Language,
Næ' succession of Lynage:
Swá of þare antiqwytè
Is lyk bot fabyl for to be.

How the Picts were cut off, both in their language and their lineage, we learn from Higden (p. 210). Their locality, with a quotation bearing on the history of the English dialects, is found in Chapter V.

§ 55. *The Caledonians*). A speculative sentence of Tacitus indicates the chance of the Caledonians being Germanic.—"*Britanniam qui mortales initio coluerint, indigenæ an advecti, ut inter barbaros, parum compertum. Habitus*

corporum varii: atque ex eo argumenta: namque rutilæ Caledoniam habitantium comæ, magni artus, Germanicam originem adseverant."—Agricola, xi.

§ 56. The continuation of the passage quoted in § 55, has induced the notion that there have been in Britain Spanish, Iberic, or Basque tribes:— "*Silurum colorati vultus, et torti plerumque crines, et posita contra Hispania, Iberos veteres trajecisse, easque sedes occupâsse fidem faciunt.*" —Agricola, xi.

That Scots of Spain settled not only in Ireland, but in Wales also, is asserted by Nennius, cc. vi. vii. viii. (*Ed. Gale*, p. 100.)

To imagine that the Iberic of Spain (presuming it to be the mother-tongue of the present Basque,) is Celtic or even Indo-European, is one of the gravest errors in Etymology.

§ 57. As early as the year A. D. 1676, an opinion was advanced by* Aylett Sammes, in a work intituled "*Britannia Antiqua Illustrata*," that the first colonizers of Ireland were the merchants of Tyre and Sidon. In confirmation of this opinion the existence of several Eastern customs in Ireland was adduced by subsequent antiquarians. Further marks of an Eastern origin of the Irish were soon found in the Gaelic dialect of that country. Finally, the matter (in the eyes at least of the national writers) was satisfactorily settled by the famous discovery, attributed to General Vallancey, of the true meaning of the Carthaginian lines in Plautus.

In the *Little Carthaginian* (*Pœnulus*) of the Latin comic writer Plautus, a portion of the dialogue is carried on in the language of Carthage.

That the Punic Language of Carthage should closely resemble that of the mother-city Tyre, which was Phœni-

* Sir W. Betham's Gael and Cymry, c. iii.

cian; and that the Phœnician of Tyre should be allied to the language of Palestine and Syria, was soon remarked by the classical commentators of the time. Joseph Scaliger asserted that the Punic of the Pænulus *differed but little from pure Hebrew* :—"*Ab Hebraismi puritate parum abesse.*"

Emendated and interpreted by Bochart, the ten first lines of a speech in Act v. s. 1. stand thus:—

1. N'yth aloniin valonuth sicorath jismacon sith
2. Chy-mlachai jythmu mitslia mittebariim ischi
3. Liphorcaneth yth beni ith jad adi ubinuthai
4. Birua rob syllohom alonim ubymisyrtohom
5. Byththym moth ymoth othi helech Antidamarchon
6. Ys sideli: brim tyfel yth chili schontem liphul
7. Uth bin imys dibur thim nocuth nu' Agorastocles
8. Ythem aneti hy chyr saely choc, sith naso.
9. Binni id chi lu hilli gubylim lasibil thym
10. Body aly thera ynn' yss' immoncon lu sim—

The Same, in Hebrew characters.

1. נא את עליונים ועליונות שכורת יסמכון זאת:
2. כי מלכי נתמו: מצליח מדבריהם עסקי:
3. לפורקנת את בני את יד עדי ובנותי:
4. ברוח רב שלהם עליונים ובמשורתהם:
5. בטרם מות חנות אותי הלך אנתידתמרכון:
6. איש שידעלי: ברם טפל את חילי שכינתם לאפל:
7. את בן אמין דבור תם נקוט נוה אנורסטוקליס:
8. חותם חנותי הוא כיור שאלי חוק זאת נושא:
9. ביני עד כי לו האלה גבולים לשבת תם:
10. בואדי עלי תרע אנא: הנו אשאל אם מנכר לו שם:

Six lines following these were determined to be *Liby*-Phœnician, or the language of the native Africans in the

neighbourhood of Carthage, mixed with Punic. These, it was stated, had the same meaning with the ten lines in Carthaginian.

The following lines of Plautus have, by all commentators, been viewed in the same light; *viz.* as the Latin version of the speech of the Carthaginian.

1. Deos Deasque veneror, qui hanc urbem colunt,
2. Ut, quod de mea re huc veni, rite venerim.
3. Measque hic ut gnatas, et mei fratris filium
4. Reperire me siritis : Di vostram fidem !
5. Quæ mihi surruptæ sunt, et fratris filium :
6. Sed hic mihi antehac hospes Antidamas fuit.
7. Eum fecisse aiunt, sibi quod faciendum fuit.
8. Ejus filium hic esse prædicant Agorastoclem :
9. Deum Hospitalem et tesseram mecum fero :
10. In hisce habitare monstratum est regionibus.
11. Hos percunctabor, qui huc egrediuntur foras.

Guided by the metrical *paraphrase* of the original author, Bochart laid before the scholars of his time a Latin version, of which the following is an English translation.

Close Translation of Bochart's Latin Version.

1. I ask the Gods and Goddesses that preside over this city,
2. That my plans may be fulfilled.— May my business prosper under their guidance !
3. The release of my son and my daughters from the hands of a robber.
4. May the Gods grant this, through the mighty spirit that is in them, and by their providence !
5. Before his death, Antidamarchus used to sojourn with me,
6. A man intimate with me: but he has joined the ranks of those whose dwelling is in darkness (the dead).
7. There is a general report that his son has here taken his abode ; *viz.* Agorastocles.
8. The token (tally) of my claim to hospitality is a carven tablet, the sculpture whereof is my God. This I carry.
9. A witness has informed me that he lives in this neighbourhood.
10. Somebody comes this way through the gate : Behold him : I 'll ask him whether he knows the name.

To professed Classics and to professed Orientalists, the version of Bochart has, *on the whole*, appeared satisfactory. Divisions of opinion there have been, it is true, even amongst those who received it; but merely upon matters of detail. Some have held that the Punic is Syriac rather than Hebraic, whilst others have called in to its interpretation the Arabic, the Maltese, or the Chaldee; all (be it observed) languages akin to the Hebrew. Those who look farther than this for their affinities, Gesenius* dismisses in the following cavalier and cursory manner:— "*Ne eorum somnia memorem, qui e Vasconum et Hiberniæ Linguis huic causæ succurri posse opinati sunt; de quibus copiosius referre piget.*"

The remark of Gesenius concerning the pretended affinities between the Punic and Hibernian arose from the discovery attributed to General Vallancey; *viz.* that the speech in Plautus was Irish Gaelic, and consequently that the Irish was Carthaginian, and *vice versâ*. The word *attributed* is used because the true originator of the hypothesis was not Vallancey, but O'Neachtan.

The Gaelic Version.

1. N'iaith all o nimh uath lonnaithe socruidshe me comsith
2. Chimi lach chuinigh! muini is toil, miocht beiridh iar mo seith
3. Liomhtha can ati bi mitche ad éadan beannaithe
4. Bior nar ob siladh umhal: o nimh! ibhim a frotha!
5. Beith liom! mo thime noctaithe; neil ach tan ti daisic mac coinme
6. Is i de leabhraim tafach leith, chi lis con teampluibh ulla
7. Uch bin nim i is de beart inn a ccomhnuithe Agorastocles!
8. Itche mana ith a chithirsi; leicceath sith nosa!
9. Buaine na iad cheile ile: gabh liom an la so bithim'!
10. Bo dileachtach nionath n' isle, mon cothoil us im.

* Scripturæ Linguæque Phœniciæ Monumenta, iv. 3.

In English.

1. Omnipotent much-dreaded Deity of this country! assuage my troubled mind!
2. Thou! the support of feeble captives! being now exhausted with fatigue, of thy free will guide to my children!
3. O let my prayers be perfectly acceptable in thy sight!
4. An inexhaustible fountain to the humble; O Deity! let me drink of its streams!
5. Forsake me not! my earnest desire is now disclosed, which is only that of recovering my daughters.
6. This was my fervent prayer, lamenting their misfortunes in thy sacred temples.
7. O bounteous Deity! it is reported here dwelleth Agorastocles.
8. Should my request appear just, let here my disquietudes cease.
9. Let them be no longer concealed; O that I may this day find my daughters!
10. They will be fatherless, and preys to the worst of men, unless it be thy pleasure that I should find them.

Whoever wishes for fuller knowledge concerning the Punic specimens in Plautus, and the notions to which they have given rise, is referred to Sir W. Betham's Gael and Cymry, and to the Phœnician Monuments of Gesenius. In the second scene of Act V. some fragmentary Phœnician is interspersed with the dialogue.

From the quotations already given, the general reader may see that both the text and the translation of Plautus are least violated in the reading and rendering of Bochart; whilst the professed Philologist need only be reminded that with the latitude of sense and the latitude of text that the Gaelic commentators allow themselves, there are no two tongues so different but what they might be shown to be identical.

To those writers who, denying the affinity between the Irish and Welsh, can identify the Erse with the Hebrew, I apply the term *Nyctalopia* (the power of seeing best in the

dark), applied by a writer in one of the periodicals to similar Etymologists.

§ 58. *The hypothesis of an Aboriginal Finnic People*).— This hypothesis, which has at least the merit of coming from a writer of genius, is grounded upon the following lines of reasoning. In the Celtic stock, it is the Gaelic branch that is the oldest, and in the Gothic stock the Scandinavian is anterior to the Teutonic. Of the two divisions, the Low German is the most ancient. The Hellenic branch is younger than the Italian. With the antiquity of a language its geographical position coincides; in other words, the older languages lie either West or North of the newer ones. The East is the fountain-head of the Indo-Europeans. The Celtic stock (its Gaelic branch going first) was driven westward by the Low Germanic branch of the Gothic stock. The Low Germans were pressed upon by the High, and these by the Slavonic nations. The pressure forced the retirers either westward, northward, or to mountain fastnesses. The Aborigines of Europe were Finnic tribes. Of these, the Laps and Proper Finlanders were pressed northwards. The Basques withdrew to the Pyrénées. Just as in Scandinavia there was a Lappish race, anterior to the immigration of the Goths, so was there the same in Britain.

END OF PART I.

PART II.

SOUNDS, LETTERS, PRONUNCIATION, SPELLING.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL NATURE OF ARTICULATE SOUNDS.

§ 59. To two points connected with the subject of the following Chapter, the attention of the reader is requested.

I. In the comparison of sounds the ear is liable to be misled by the eye.

The syllables *ka* and *ga* are similar syllables. The Vowel is in each the same, and the Consonant is but slightly different. Now the words *ka* and *ga* are more allied to each other than the words *ka* and *ba*, *ka* and *ta*, &c. &c., because the consonantal sounds of *k* and *g*, are more allied than the consonantal sounds of *k* and *b*, *k* and *t*.

Now comparing the syllables *ga* and *ka*, we see the affinity between the sounds, and we see it at the first glance. It lies on the surface, and strikes the ear at once.

It is, however, very evident that ways might be devised, or might arise from accident, of concealing the likeness between the two sounds, or, at any rate, of making it less

palpable. One of such ways would be a faulty mode of spelling. If instead of *ga* we wrote *gha*, the following would be the effect: the syllable would appear less simple than it really was; it would look as if it consisted of three parts instead of two, and consequently its affinity to *ka* would seem less than it really was. It is perfectly true that a little consideration would tell us that, as long as the sound remained the same, the relations of the two syllables remained the same; and that, if the contrary appeared to be the case, the ear was misled by the eye. Still a little consideration would be required. Now in the English language we have, amongst others, the following modes of spelling that have a tendency to mislead.

The sounds of *ph* and of *f*, in *Philip* and *fillip*, differ to the eye, but to the ear are identical. Here a difference is simulated.

The sounds of *th* in *thin*, and of *th* in *thine*, differ to the ear, but to the eye seem the same. Here a difference is disguised.

These last sounds (for this may be said of each) appear to the eye to be double or compound. This is not the case; they are simple single sounds, and not the sounds of *t* followed by *h*, as the spelling leads us to imagine.

II. Besides improper modes of spelling, there is another way of concealing the true nature of sounds. If I say that *ka* and *ga* are allied, the alliance is manifest; since I compare the actual sounds. If I say *ka* and *gee* are allied, the alliance is concealed; since I compare, not the actual sounds, but only the names of the letters that express those sounds. Now in the English language we have, amongst others, the following names of letters that have a tendency to mislead.

The sounds *fa* and *va* are allied. The names *eff* and *vee* conceal this alliance.

The sounds *sa* and *za* are allied. The names *ess* and *zed* conceal the alliance.

In comparing sounds it is advisable to have nothing to do either with letters or names of letters. Compare the sounds themselves.

In many cases it is sufficient, in comparing Consonants, to compare syllables that contain those Consonants; *e. g.* to determine the relations of *p*, *b*, *f*, *v*, we say *pa*, *ba*, *fa*, *va*; or for those of *s* and *z*, we say *sa*, *za*. Here we compare *syllables*, each Consonant being followed by a Vowel. At times this is insufficient. We are often obliged to isolate the Consonant from its Vowel, and bring our organs to utter (or half utter) the imperfect sounds of *p*', *b*', *t*', *d*'. In doing this we isolate the Consonant.

§ 60. Let any of the *Vowels* (for instance, the *a* in *father*) be sounded. The lips, the tongue, and the parts within the throat remain in the same position: and as long as these remain in the same position the sound is that of the Vowel under consideration. Let, however, a change take place in the position of the organs of sound; let, for instance, the lips be closed, or the tongue be applied to the front part of the mouth: in that case the Vowel sound is cut short. It undergoes a change. It terminates in a sound that is different, according to the state of those organs whereof the position has been changed. If, on the Vowel in question, the lips be closed, then there arises an imperfect sound of *b* or *p*. If, on the other hand, the tongue be applied to the front teeth, or to the fore part of the palate, the sound is one (more or less imperfect) of *t* or *d*. This fact illustrates the difference between the Vowels and the Consonants. It may be verified by pronouncing the *a* in *fate*, *ee* in *feet*, *oo* in *book*, *o* in *note*, &c.

It is a further condition in the formation of a Vowel sound that the passage of the breath be uninterrupted.

In the sound of the *l'* in *lo* (isolated from its Vowel), the sound is as continuous as it is with the *a* in *fate*. Between, however, the Consonant *l*, and the Vowel *a* there is this difference:—With *a*, the passage of the breath is uninterrupted; with *l*, the tongue is applied to the palate, breaking or arresting the passage of the breath.

§ 61. The primary division of our articulate sounds is into Vowels and Consonants. The latter are again divided into Liquids (*l*, *m*, *n*, *r*,) and Mutes (*p*, *b*, *f*, *v*, *t*, *d*, *k*, *g*, *s*, *z*, &c. &c.). *Definitions* for the different sorts of articulate sounds have still to be laid down. In place of these, we have general assertions concerning the properties and qualities of the respective classes. Concerning the Vowels as a Class, we may predicate one thing, concerning the Liquids, and concerning the Mutes, another. What the nature of these assertions is will be seen after the explanation of certain terms.

§ 62. *Sharp and Flat.*)—Take the sounds of *p*, *f*, *t*, *k*, *s*, isolate them from their Vowels, and pronounce them. The sound is the sound of a whisper.

Let *b*, *v*, *d*, *g*, *z*, be similarly treated. The sound is no whisper, but one at the natural tone of our voice. Further than this, if *b* be pronounced at the whisper pitch, its sound becomes that of *p*; whilst *p* at the natural pitch of our voice is no longer *p* but *b*. Such also is the case with the rest.

Now *p*, *f*, *t*, *k*, *s*, (with some others that will be brought forward anon,) are *sharp*, whilst *b*, *v*, &c. &c. are *flat*. Instead of *sharp*, some say *hard*, and instead of *flat*, some say *soft*. The Sanskrit terms *Sonant* and *Surd* are, in a scientific point of view, the least exceptionable. They have, however, the disadvantage of being pedantic. The *Tenues* of the Classics (as far as they go) are sharp, the *Mediæ* flat.

Continuous and Explosive.)—Isolate the sounds of *b*, *p*, *t*, *d*, *k*, *g*. Pronounce them. You have no power of prolonging the sounds, or of resting upon them. They escape with the breath, and they escape at once.

It is not so with *f*, *v*, *sh*, *zh*. Here the breath is transmitted by degrees, and the sound can be drawn out and prolonged for an indefinite space of time. Now *b*, *p*, *t*, &c. &c. are Explosive, *f*, *v*, &c. &c. Continuous.

§ 63. Concerning the Vowels, we may predicate [a]) that they are all Continuous, [b]) that they are all Flat.

Concerning the Liquids, we may predicate [a]) that they are all Continuous, [b]) that they are all Flat.

Concerning the Mutes, we may predicate that [a]) one half of them is Flat, and the other half Sharp, and [b]) that some are Continuous, and that others are Explosive.

§ 64. The letter *h* is no articulate sound, but only a breathing.

For the Semivowels and the Diphthongs, see the sequel.

CHAPTER II.

SYSTEM OF ARTICULATE SOUNDS.

§ 65. THE attention of the reader is now directed to the following *foreign* Vowel sounds.

1. *é fermé*, of the French.—This is a sound allied to, but different from, the *a* in *fate*, and the *ee* in *feet*. It is intermediate to the two.

2. *u* of the French, *ü* of the Germans, *y* of the Danes.—This sound is intermediate to the *ee* in *feet*, and the *oo* in *book*.

3. *O chiuso*, of the Italians.—Intermediate to the *o* in *note* and the *oo* in *book*.

With these sounds we have the following sequences: *a* in *fate*, *é fermé*, *ee* in *feet*, *ü* in *übel* (G.), *oo* in *book*, *o* (*chiuso*), *o* in *note*. And this is the true order of alliance among the Vowels; *a* in *fate*, and *o* in *note*, being the extremes; the other sounds being transitional or intermediate. As the English Orthography is at once singular and faulty, it exhibits the relationship but imperfectly. Let *æ*=*a*, *ǽ*=*é*, *i*=*ee*, *ý*=*ü*, *u*=*oo* in *book*, *ó*=*o* in *chiuso*, and *o*=*o* in *note*, and then the sequence becomes palpable; *æ*, *ǽ*, *i*, *ý*, *u*, *ó*, *o*.

§ 66. *The System of the Mutes.*) — Preliminary to the consideration of the System of the Mutes, let it be observed:—

1. That the *th* in *thin*, is a simple single sound, different from the *th* in *thine*, and that it may be expressed by the sign þ.
2. That the *th* in *thine*, is a simple single sound, different from the *th* in *thin*, and that it may be expressed by the sign ð.
3. That the *sh* in *shine*, is a simple single sound, and that it may be expressed by the sign σ (Greek Σῖγμα).
4. That the *z* in *azure*, *glazier* (French *j*), is a simple single sound, and that it may be expressed by the sign ζ (Greek Ζῆτα).
5. That in the Laplandic, and possibly in many other languages, there are two peculiar sounds, different from any in English, German, or French, &c. &c., and that they may respectively be expressed by the sign ϰ and the sign γ (Greek Κάππα and Γάμμα).

With these preliminary notices we may exhibit the system of the Sixteen Mutes; having previously determined the meaning of two fresh terms, and bearing in mind what was said concerning the words Sharp and Flat, Continuous and Explosive.

Lene and Aspirate.)—From the sound of *p* in *pat*, the sound of *f* in *fat* differs in a certain degree. This difference is not owing to a difference in their Sharpness or Flatness. Each is Sharp. Neither is it owing to a difference in their Continuity or Explosiveness; although, at the first glance, such might appear to be the case. *F* is Continuous, whilst *p* is Explosive. *S*, however, is Continuous, and *s*, in respect to the difference under consideration, is classed not with *f* the Continuous sound, but with *p* the Explosive one. I am unable to account for the difference between *p* and *f*. It exists. It is visible. It has been expressed by a term. *P* is *Lene*, *f* is *Aspirate*.

As *f* is to *p* so is *v* to *b*.
As *v* is to *b* so is þ to *t*.
As þ is to *t* so is ð to *d*.
As ð is to *d* so is ϰ to *h*.
As ϰ is to *h* so is γ to *g*.
As γ is to *g* so is σ to *s*.
As σ is to *s* so is ζ to *z*.

Hence *p*, *b*, *t*, *d*, *k*, *g*, *s*, *z*, are *Lene*; *f*, *v*, þ, ð, ϰ, γ, σ, ζ, are *Aspirate*. Also *p*, *f*, *t*, þ, *k*, ϰ, *s*, σ, are *Sharp*, whilst *b*, *v*, *d*, ð, *g*, γ, *z*, ζ, are *Flat*; so that there is a double series relationship capable of being expressed as follows.

Lene.		*Aspirate.*		*Sharp.*		*Flat.*	
Sharp.	*Flat.*	*Sharp.*	*Flat.*	*Lene.*	*Aspirate.*	*Lene.*	*Aspirate.*
p	*b*	*f*	*v*	*p*	*f*	*b*	*v*
t	*d*	þ	ð	*t*	þ	*d*	ð
k	*g*	ϰ	γ	*k*	ϰ	*g*	γ
s	*z*	σ	ζ	*s*	σ	*z*	ζ

I am not familiar enough with the early Grammarians to know when the terms *Lene* and *Aspirate* were first used. They were the Latin equivalents to the Greek words, ψιλον (*psilon*) and δασυ (*dasy*) respectively. The Greek terms are preferable. *They* convey no determinate idea, whereas the Latin terms convey a false one. The origin of the word Aspirate I imagine to be as follows. The Latin language wanting both the sound of the Greek *Theta*, and the sign to express it (θ), rendered it by *th*. This Orthography engenders the notion that θ differed from τ by the addition of the aspirate *h*. How false this view really is may be seen in Chapter III. To guard against similar false notions, I never hereafter use the word Aspirate without qualifying it by the addition of the Adjective *so-called*.

All the so-called Aspirates are Continuous; and with the exception of *s* and *z*, all the Lenes are Explosive.

I believe that in the fact of each Mute appearing in a fourfold form, (*i. e.* Sharp, or Flat, Lene, or (so-called) Aspirate,) lies the essential character of the Mutes as opposed to the Liquids.

Y and *w*.)—These sounds, respectively intermediate to *γ* and *i* (the *ee* in *feet*), and to *v* and *u* (*oo* in *book*), form a transition from the Vowels to the Consonants.

§ 67. It has been seen that the Sixteen Mutes are reducible to four Series. Of these Series, *p*, *t*, *k*, *s*, may respectively be taken as the types. Of the Liquids it may be predicated as follows:—

1. That *m* is allied to the Series *p*.—The combination *inp* has a tendency to become *imp*.

2. That *n* is allied to the Series *t*.—The combination *imt* has a tendency to become either *impt*, or *int*.

3. That *l* is allied to the Series *k*.—The evidence of this lies deep in Comparative Philology.

4. That *r* is allied to the Series *s*.—The evidence of this is of the same nature with that of the preceding assertion.

The Series *p* and *k* have this peculiarity.—They are connected with the Vowels through *w* and *u* (*oo*), and through *y* and *i* (*ee*) respectively.

§ 68. The French word *roi*, the English word *oil*, *house*, are specimens of a fresh class of articulations; *viz.* of Compound-Vowel Sounds or Diphthongs. The Diphthong *oi* is the Vowel *o* modified, *plus* the *Semi*vowel *y* (not the *Vowel i*) modified. The Diphthongal sound in *roi* is the Vowel *o* modified, *plus* the Semivowel *w* (not the Vowel *u* or *oo*) modified. In *roi* the Semivowel element precedes, in *oil* it follows. In *roi* it is the Semivowel allied to Series *p*; in *oil* it is the Semivowel allied to Series *k*. *The nature*

of the modification that the component parts of a Diphthong undergo has yet to be determined; although it is certain there is one. If it were not so, the Articulations would be *Double*, not *Compound.*

The words quoted indicate the nature of the Diphthongal System.

1st. Diphthongs with the Semivowel *w*, *a*) preceding, as in the French word *roi*, *b*) following, as in the English word *new.*

2nd. Diphthongs with Semivowel *y*, *a*) preceding, as is common in the languages of the Lithuanic and Slavonic stocks, *b*) following, as in the word *oil.*

3rd. Triphthongs with a Semivowel both preceding and following.

The Diphthongs in English are four; *ow* as in *house*, *ew* as in *new*, *oi* as in *oil*, *i* as in *bite, fight.*

§ 69. *Chest, Jest.*—Here we have compound Consonantal Sounds. The *ch* in *chest* is $t+sh$ (σ), the *j* in *jest* is $d+zh$ (ζ). I believe that in these combinations one or both the elements, *viz. t* and *sh*, *d* and *zh*, are modified; but I am unable to state the nature of this modification. A short work of Professor Rask's has exhibited the Systematic Series of Compounds that are evolved by the combination of the Mutes of Series *t* and Series *s*. In *chest* and *jest* the *t* and *d* are Lene, the (σ) *sh* and (ζ) *zh* Aspirate. But as the (so-called) Aspirates of Series *t*, and the Lenes of Series *s*, may enter into similar compositions, we have as a result the following possible combinations; *viz.* $t+s$ expressed by *c*; $t+sh$ expressed by *c'*; $d+z$ expressed by ȝ; $d+zh$ expressed by ȝ', $þ+s$, $þ+sh$, $ð+z$, $ð+zh$. For these latter sounds we are referred to the Laplandic, the Georgian, and the Armenian languages.

What, according to Rask, takes place with the Series *s* and *t*, takes place also (as I have convinced myself) with

the Series *s* and *k*. At least, the *possible* combinations I hold to be the same; although it is evident that compounds like *x*+*sh*, *γ*+*zh*, &c. are rarer than the compounds *þ*+*sh*, *ð*+*zh*, &c. just in proportion as the elementary sounds *x* and *γ* are rarer than the elementary sounds *þ* and *ð*. The possible sequence then of Series *k*+ Series *s*, is *k*+*s*, *k*+*sh*, *g*+*z*, *g*+*zh*, *x*+*s*, *x*+*sh*, *γ*+*z*, *γ*+*zh*. Of these the combination *k*+*sh* exists, and in some of the forthcoming trains of argument will be frequently brought forward.

S, *sh*, *z*, *zh*, from the Latin word *Sibilans* = *hissing*, have been called *Sibilant* or *Hissing* Letters. The *ch* (in *chest*), *j* (in *jest*), are Compound Sibilants.

§ 70. *Ng*).—The sound of the *ng* in *sing*, *king*, *throng*, when at the end of a word, or of *singer*, *ringing*, &c. &c. in the middle of a word, is not the natural sound of the combination *n* and *g*, each letter retaining its natural power and sound; but a simple single sound, of which the combination *ng* is a conventional mode of expressing. The simple sound is related, however, to *n* and *g* in a manner that has not yet been determined.

§ 71. Other terms, chiefly relating to the Vowels, have still to be explained. The *é* of the French has been called *fermé*, or *close* (Italian, *chiuso*). Its opposite, the *a* in *fate*, is *open*. The importance of the *close* Vowels has been seen in the circumstance of *é*, *ý*, *ó* being respectively intermediate to *a* and *ee*, *ee* and *oo*, *oo* and *o*.

Compared with *a* in *fate*, and the *o* in *note*, *a* in *father*, and the *aw* in *bawl*, are Broad, the Vowels of *note* and *fate* being Slender.

In *fat*, the Vowel is, according to common parlance, *Short;* in *fate*, it is *Long*. Here we have the introduction of two fresh terms. For the words *Long* and *Short*, I would fain substitute *Independent* and *Dependent*. If from

the word *fate* I separate the final consonantal sound, the syllable *fa* remains. In this syllable the *a* has precisely the sound that it had before. It remains unaltered. The removal of the Consonant has in no wise modified its sound or power. It is not so with the Vowel in the word *fat*. If from this I remove the Consonant following, and so leave the *a* at the end of the syllable, instead of in the middle, I must do one of two things: I must sound it either as the *a* in *fate*, or else as the *a* in *father*. Its (so-called) short sound it cannot retain, unless it be supported by a Consonant following. For this reason it is *Dependent*. The same is the case with all the so-called short sounds, *viz.* the *e* in *bed*, *i* in *fit*, *u* in *bull*, *o* in *not*, *u* in *but*.

To the preceding remarks, the following statements may be added.

1st. That the words *Independent* and *Dependent* correspond with the terms *Perfect* and *Imperfect* of the Hebrew grammarians.

2nd. That the Hebrew grammars give us the truest notions respecting these particular properties of Vowels.

The following sentences are copied from Lee's Hebrew Grammar, Art. 33, 34: — "By *perfect Vowels*, is meant "Vowels which, being preceded by a Consonant," (*or without being so preceded,*) "will constitute a complete syl- "lable, as בָ *bā*. By *imperfect Vowels* is meant, those "Vowels which are not generally" (*never*) "found to con- "stitute syllables without either the addition of a Conso- "nant or of an Accent. Such syllables, therefore, must be "either like בַּד *bad*, or בָ *bā*, *i. e.* followed by a Consonant, "or accompanied by an Accent." For further remarks on this subject, see the Chapter on Accent.

Before *i*, *e*, and *y* of the English Alphabet, and before *ü* and *ö* German, the letters *c* and *g* have the tendency to assume the sound and power of *s* or *z*, of *sh* or *zh*, of *ch*

or *j*; in other words, of becoming either *s* or some sound allied to *s*. Compared with *a*, *o*, and *u* (as in *gat*, *got*, *gun*), which are *full*, *i*, *e*, *y*, are *small* Vowels.

It is not every Vowel that is susceptible of every modification. *I* (*ee*) and *u* (*oo*) are incapable of becoming Broad. *E* in *bed* (as I have convinced myself), although both Broad and Slender, is incapable of becoming Independent. For the *u* in *but*, and for the *ö* of certain foreign languages, I have no satisfactory systematic position.

§ 72. *Vowel System.*

Broad.	*Slender.*	
Independent.	*Independent.*	*Dependent.*
a, in *father*	*a*, in *fate*	*a*, in *fat.*
	e, *fermé*, *Long*	*e*, *fermé*, *Short.*
e, in *meine*, *Germ*		*e*, in *bed.*
	ee, in *feet*	*i*, in *pit.*
	ü, of the German, *Long*	the same, *Short.*
	oo, in *book*	*ou*, in *could.*
	o, *chiuso*	the same, *Short.*
aw, in *bawl*	*o*, in *note*	*o*, in *note.*

From these, the Semivowels *w* and *y* make a transition to the Consonants *v* and the so-called aspirate of *g* (*γ*, not in English).

§ 73. *System of Consonants.*

Liquids.	*Mutes.*				*Semi-Vowels.*
	Lene.		*Aspirate.*		
	Sharp.	*Flat.*	*Sharp.*	*Flat.*	
m	*p*	*v*	*f*	*v*	*w*
n	*t*	*d*	*þ*	*ð*	.
l	*k*	*g*	*κ*	*γ*	*y*
r	*s*	*z*	*σ*	*ζ*	.

§ 74. Concerning the Vowel System I venture no assertion. The Consonantal System I conceive to have been exhibited above in its whole fulness. The number of Mutes, *specifically* distinct, I consider to be Sixteen and

no more: the number of Liquids Four. What then are the powers of the numerous letters in Alphabets like those of Arabia and Armenia? What is the German *ch*, and Irish *gh*? Varieties of one or other of the sounds exhibited above, and not articulations specifically distinct.

§ 75. There is a *difference between a connexion in Phonetics and a connexion in Grammar.* Phonetics is a word expressive of the subject-matter of the present Chapter. The present Chapter determines (amongst other things) the systematic relation of Articulate Sounds. The word *Phônœticos* (φωνήτικος) signifies *appertaining to Articulate Sounds.* It is evident that between sounds like *b* and *v*, *s* and *z*, there is a connexion in Phonetics. Now in the Grammar of languages there is often a change, or a Permutation of Letters: *e. g.* in the words *tooth*, *teeth*, the Vowel, in *price*, *prize*, the Consonant, is changed. Here there is a connexion in Grammar.

That the letters most closely allied in Phonetics should be most frequently interchanged in Grammar is what, on *à priori* grounds, we most naturally are led to expect. And that such is *often* the case the study of languages tells us. That, however, it is always so would be a hasty and an erroneous assertion. The Greek language changes *p* into *f*. Here the connexion in Phonetics and the connexion in language coincide. The Welsh language changes *p* into *m*. Here the connexion in Phonetics and the connexion in language do *not* coincide.

CHAPTER III.

ON CERTAIN COMBINATIONS OF ARTICULATE SOUNDS.

§ 76. CERTAIN combinations of Articulate Sounds are incapable of being pronounced. The following Rule is one that, in the forthcoming pages, will frequently be referred to. *Two (or more)* Mutes *of different degrees of Sharpness and Flatness, are incapable of coming together in the same syllable.* For instance, *b*, *v*, *d*, *g*, *z*, &c. &c. being Flat, and *p*, *f*, *t*, *k*, *s*, &c. &c. being Sharp, such combinations as *abt*, *avt*, *apd*, *afd*, *agt*, *akd*, *atz*, *ads*, &c. &c. are unpronounceable. *Spelt*, indeed, they may be; but attempts at pronunciation end in a *change* of the combination. In this case either the Flat letter is changed to its Sharp equivalent (*b* to *p*, *d* to *t*, &c.) or, *vice versâ* (*p* to *b*, *t* to *d*). The combinations *abt* and *agt*, to be pronounced, must become either *apt* or *abd*, or else *akt*, or *agd*.

For determining which of the two letters shall be changed, in other words, whether it shall be the first that accommodates itself to the second, or the second that accommodates itself to the first, there is no general rule. This is settled by the particular habit of the language in consideration.

The word *Mutes* in the second sentence of this section must be dwelt on. It is only with the *Mutes* that there is an impossibility of pronouncing the heterogeneous com-

binations above-mentioned. The Liquids and the Vowels are Flat (see § 63); but the Liquids and Vowels, although Flat, may be followed by a Sharp Consonant. If this were not the case the combination *ap*, *at*, *alp*, *alt*, &c. would be unpronounceable.

The Semivowels, although Flat, admit of being followed by a Sharp Consonant.

The law exhibited above may be called the Law of Accommodation.

Combinations like *gt*, *kd*, &c. may be called Incompatible Combinations.

§ 77. *Unstable Combinations.*)—That certain sounds in combination with others have a tendency to undergo changes, may be collected from the observation of our own language, as we find it spoken around us, or by ourselves. The *ew* in *new* is a sample of what may be called an Unsteady or Unstable Combination. There is a natural tendency to change it either into *oo* (*noo*) or *yoo* (*nyoo*); perhaps also in *yew* (*nyew*).

§ 78. *Effect of the Semivowel y on certain letters when they precede it.*)—Taken by itself the Semivowel *y*, followed by a Vowel, (*ya*, *yee*, *yo*, *yu*, &c.) forms a Stable Combination. Not so, however, if it be preceded by a Consonant, of the Series *t*, *k*, or *s*, as *tya*, *tyo*; *dya*, *dyo*; *kya*, *kyo*; *sya*, *syo*. There then arises an Unsteady Combination. *Sya* and *syo* we pronounce as *sha* and *sho*; *tya* and *dya* we pronounce as *cha* and *ja* (*i. e. tsh*, *dzh*). This we may verify from our pronunciation of words like *sure*, *picture*, *verdure*, (*shoor*, *pictshoor*, *verdzhoor*,) having previously remarked that the *u* in those words is not sounded as *oo* but as *yoo*. The effect of the Semivowel *y*, taken with Unsteadiness of the Combination *ew*, accounts for the tendency to pronounce *dew* as if written *jew*.

§ 79. *The Evolution of new Sounds.*) — To an English ear the sound of the German *ch* falls strange. To an English organ it is at first difficult to pronounce. The same is the case with the German Vowels *ö* and *ü*, and with the French sounds *u*, *eu*, &c. &c.

To a German, however, and a Frenchman, the sound of the English *th* (either in *thin* or *thine*) is equally a matter of difficulty.

The reason of this lies in the fact of the respective sounds being absent in the German, French, and English languages: since sounds are easy or hard to pronounce just in proportion as we have been familiarized with them.

There is no instance of a new sound being introduced at once into a language. Where they originate at all, they are *evolved*, not imported.

Upon the Phenomena of Evolution the contents of § § 78, 77, 76, must be made to bear. These phenomena may be illustrated by the following examples.

Let there be a language where there is no such a sound as that of *z*, but where there *is* the sound of *s*, and the sound of *z* may be evolved under (amongst others) the following conditions. (1.) Let there be a number of words ending in the Flat Mutes; as *slab*, *stag*, *stud*, &c. &c. (2.) Let a given form (the Plural Number or the Genitive Case) be formed by the addition of *is*, or *es*; as *slabis*, *stages*, *studes*, &c. &c. (3.) Let the tendency that words have to contract eject the intermediate Vowel *e*, or *i*, so that the *s* of the Inflection (a *Sharp* Mute) and the *b*, *d*, *g*, &c. of the original word (*Flat* Mutes) be brought in juxta-position, *slabs*, *studs*, *stags*. There is then an incompatible termination, and one of two changes must take place; either *b*, *d*, or *g*, must become *p*, *t*, or *k*,

(*slaps*, *staks*, *stuts*); or *s* must become *z*, *stagz*, *studz*, *slabz*. In this latter case *z* is evolved. Again,

Let there be a language wherein there are no such sounds as *sh*, *ch* (*tsh*), or *j* (*dzh*); but where there are the sounds of *s*, *t*, *d*, and *y*.

Let a change affect the Unsteady Combinations *sy*, *ty*, *dy*. From this will arise the evolved sounds of *sh*, *ch*, and *j*.

The Phenomena of Evolution help to determine the Pronunciation of Dead Languages.

§ 80. *On the value of a sufficient System of Sounds.*)—In certain imaginable cases, a language may be materially affected by the paucity of its elementary articulate sounds.

In a given language let there be the absence of the sound *z*, the other conditions being those noted in the case of the words *stag*, *slab*, *stud*, &c. &c. Let the intermediate Vowel be ejected. Then, instead of the *s* being changed into an evolved *z*, let the other alternative take place; so that the words become *staks*, *slaps*, *stuts*. In this latter case we have an alteration of the original word, brought about by the Insufficiency of the System of Articulate Sounds.

§ 81. *Double Consonants rare.*)—It cannot be too clearly understood that in words like *pitted*, *stabbing*, *massy*, &c. &c. &c. there is no reduplication of the sounds of *t*, *b*, and *s*, respectively. Between the words *pitted* (as with the small-pox) and *pitied* (as being an object of pity) there is a difference in spelling only. In speech the words are identical. *The reduplication of the Consonant is in English, and the generality of languages, a conventional mode of expressing upon paper the shortness* (*dependence*) *of the Vowel that precedes.* The rationale of this may be seen in the Chapter on Orthography.

Real reduplications of Consonants, *i. e.* reduplications of their *sound*, are, in all languages, extremely rare. I am fully aware of certain statements made respecting the Laplandic and Finlandic languages, *viz.* that doubled Consonants are, in them, of common occurrence. Notwithstanding this, I have an impression that it is under one condition (and one only) that true reduplication takes place. In compound and derived words, where the original root *ends*, and the inflectional affix *begins* with the same letter, there is a reduplication of the sound, and not otherwise. In the word *soulless*, the *l* is doubled to the ear as well as to the eye; and it is a foul pronunciation to call it *souless* (*soless*). In the Deformed Transformed it is made to rhyme with *no less*, improperly.

> Clay, not dead but soulless,
> Though no mortal man would choose thee,
> An immortal no less
> Deigns not to refuse thee.

In the following words, all of which are Compounds, we have true specimens of the Doubled Consonant.

n	is doubled in	*unnatural, innate, oneness.*
l		*soulless, civil-list, palely.*
k		*book-case.*
t		*seaport-town.*

It must not, however, be concealed that, in the mouths even of correct speakers, one of the doubled sounds is often dropped.

§ 82. *True Aspirates rare.*) —The criticism applied to words like *pitted*, &c. &c. applies also to words like *Philip*, *thin*, *thine*, &c. &c. There is therein no sound of *h*. How the so-called Aspirates differ from their corresponding Lenes has not yet been determined; that it is *not* by the

addition of *h* is evident. *Ph* and *th* are conventional modes of spelling simple single sounds, which might better be expressed by simple single signs.

In our own language the *true* Aspirates, like the true reduplications, are found only in compound words; and there they are often slurred in the pronunciation.

We find	*p* and *h*	in the words	*haphazard, upholder.*
—	*b* and *h*	—	*abhorrent, cub-hunting.*
—	*f* and *h*	—	*knife-handle, offhand.*
—	*v* and *h*	—	*stave-head.*
—	*d* and *h*	—	*adhesive, childhood.*
—	*t* and *h*	—	*nuthook.*
—	*th* and *h*	—	*withhold.*
—	*k* and *h*	—	*inkhorn, bakehouse.*
—	*g* and *h*	—	*gig-horse.*
—	*s* and *h*	—	*race-horse, falsehood.*
—	*z* and *h*	—	*exhibit, exhort (egzibit, egzort).*
—	*r* and *h*	—	*perhaps.*
—	*l* and *h*	—	*well-head, foolhardy.*
—	*m* and *h*	—	*Amherst.*
—	*n* and *h*	—	*unhinge, inherent, unhappy.*

Now in certain languages the *true* Aspirates are of common occurrence, *i. e.* sounds like the *t* in *nuthook*, the *ph* in *haphazard*, &c. &c. are as frequent as the sounds of *p*, *b*, *s*, &c. &c. In the spelling of these sounds by means of the English we are hampered by the circumstance of *th* and *ph* being already used in a different sense. If the language in point were such a language as the Eskimaux, one with which few but professed Etymologists have to deal, the embarrassment would be unimportant. The language, however, where the true Aspirates occur is the Hindoo of the East Indies, a language with which Englishmen, above other nations, come in contact.

CHAPTER IV.

EUPHONY; THE PERMUTATION, AND THE TRANSITION OF LETTERS.

§ 83. 1. Let there be two syllables, of which the one ends in *m*, and the other begins with *r*, as we have in the syllables *num-* and *-rus* of the Latin word *numerus*.

2. Let an ejection of the intervening letters bring these two syllables into immediate contact, *numrus*. The *m* and *r* form an Unstable Combination (see § 77). To remedy this there is a tendency (mark, not an absolute necessity) to insert an intervening sound.

In English the form which the Latin word *numerus* takes, is *Number;* in Spanish *Nombre*. The *b* makes no part of the original word, but has been inserted for the sake of Euphony; or, to speak more properly, by a Euphonic Process. The word Euphony is derived from Ευ (*well,*) and φώνη (*fônæ*, a voice). The province of Euphony has not been very accurately determined.

§ 84. In the word *Number*, *Nombre*, the letter inserted was *b;* and for *b* being the particular letter employed, there is a reason derived from the *System* of Articulate Sounds.

1. That the letter inserted should be a Consonant is evident. The *Vowel e* (in *numerus*) had been previously ejected.

2. That it should be a Mute is evident. A Liquid would have given the unstable or unpronounceable combinations, *mnr*, *mlr*, *mrr*, *mmr*.

3. That it should be a Consonant either of Series *b*, or of Series *s*, was natural: it being Series *b*, and Series *s*, with which *m* and *r* are respectively connected (see § 67).

4. That it should be a Consonant of Series *b*, rather than one of Series *r*, we collect from the fact that *msr* (*numsrus*) or *mzr* (*numzrus*), give inharmonious, and, consequently, Unstable Combinations.

5. That of the *b* Series, it should be *b* or *v* (Flat) rather than *p* or *f* (Sharp), we infer from the fact of *m* and *r* both being Flat.

6. Of *v* and *b*, the latter alone gives a Stable Combination, so that we have the Spanish form *nombre*, and not *nomvre*.

In this we have an illustration of the use of attending to the nature and connexions of Articulate Sounds in general.

§ 85. The affinity of *m* for the Series *b*, of *n* for the Series *t*, gives occasion to further Euphonic changes. The combinations *mt*, *md*, *mþ*, *mð*, are Unstable. The syllables *emt*, *emd*, are liable to one of two modifications. Either *p* or *b* will be inserted, and so make them *empt* (as in *tempt*), *embd* (as in *Embden*), or else the *m* will become *n*, forming the syllable *ent*, *end*, *enþ*, *enð*.

Similar tendencies, in a certain degree, affect the combination *enp*, *enb*. They are liable to become *emp*, or *emb*. Any one may see that the word *enperor* embarrasses the utterance.

§ 86. The combination *tupt* is Stable, so also is the combination *tuft*. But the combination *tupth* is Unstable: the *p* is Lene, the *f* is a (so-called) Aspirate.

Hence a process of accommodation by which the word becomes either *tupt* or *tufth* (*tufþ*).

In respect to the Unstable Combination *tupth*, we may observe this, *viz.* that the ways of altering are two. Either the first letter may be accommodated to the second, *tufþ*, or the second may be accommodated to the first, *tuft*. Which of these two changes shall take place is determined by the particular habit of the language. In Greek we add to the radical syllable τυπ, the inflectional syllable -θην. The *first* letter, π, is accommodated to the second, θ, and the word becomes τυφθην (*tyfþæn*), as in ἐτύφθην (*etyfþæn*). In English we add to the radical syllable *stag*, the inflectional syllable *s*. Here the second letter is accommodated to the first, and the resulting word is not *staks*, but *stagz*.

§ 87. The Irish Gaelic, above most other languages, illustrates a Euphonic principle that modifies the Vowels of a word. The Vowels *a*, *o*, *u*, as seen in § 71, are Full, whilst *i*, *e*, *y*, are Small. Now if to a syllable containing a small Vowel, as *bwil*, there be added a syllable containing a Broad one, as *-am*, a change takes place. Either the first syllable is accommodated to the second, or the second to the first; so that the Vowels respectively contained in them are either both Full or both Small. Hence arises, in respect to the word quoted, either the form *bwalam*, or else the form *builim*.

The Latin word *instituo*, from *in* and *statuo*, (amongst others,) illustrates this Euphonic process. The bearings of this fact will be seen in the sequel.

§ 88. In the words *Give* and *Gave* we have a change of Tense expressed by a change of Vowel. In the word *Price* and *Prize* a change of meaning is expressed by a change of Consonant. In *clothe* and *clad* there is a change both of a Vowel and of a Consonant. In the words *to use*

and *a use*, there is a similar change; although it is not expressed by the spelling. To the ear the Verb *to use* ends in *z*, although not to the eye. The following are instances of the Permutation of Letters.

Permutation of Vowels.

a	to	*ĕ*,	as	*man, men.*
a	to	*oo*,	as	*stand, stood.*
a	to	*u*,	as	*dare, durst.*
a	to	*ē*,	as	*was, were.*
ea	to	*o*,	as	*speak, spoken.*
ea=*ĕ*	to	*ea*=*ē*,	as	*breath, breathe.*
ee	to	*ĕ*,	as	*deep, depth.*
ea	to	*o*,	as	*bear, bore.*
i	to	*a*,	as	*spin, span.*
i	to	*u*,	as	*spin, spun.*
ī=*ei*	to	*o*,	as	*smite, smote.*
i=*ei*	to	*ĭ*,	as	*smite, smitten.*
i	to	*a*,	as	*give, gave.*
i=*ej*	to	*a*,	as	*rise, raise.*
ĭ	to	*e*,	as	*sit, set.*
ow	to	*ew*,	as	*blow, blew.*
o	to	*e*,	as	*strong, strength.*
oo	to	*ee*,	as	*tooth, teeth.*
o	to	*i*,	as	*top, tip.*
o	to	*e*,	as	*old, elder, tell, told.*
ŏ	to	*e*,	as	*brother, brethren.*
ō=*oo*	to	*i*,	as	*do, did.*
o=*oo*	to	*o*=*ŭ*	as	*do, done.*
oo	to	*o*	as	*choose, chose.*

Permutation of Consonants.

f	to	*v*,	*left, leave, life, live, calf, calves.*
þ	to	*ð*,	*breath, to breathe.*
þ	to	*d*,	*seethe, sod, clothe, clad.*
d	to	*t*,	*build, built.*
s	to	*z*,	*use, to use.*
s	to	*r*,	*was, were, lose, forlorn, rear, raise.*

In *have* and *had* we have the *ejection* of a sound; in *work* and *wrought*, the *transposition* of one. Important changes are undergone by the sounds *h*, *g*, and the allied ones *nh*, *ng*, *y*, as will be seen in the Chapter on Verbs.

Permutation of Combinations.

i=*ei*	to	*ow*,	as	*grind, ground.*
ow	to	*i*=*ei*,	as	*mouse, mice, cow, kine.*
ink	to	*augh*	as	*drink, draught.*
ing	to	*ough*,	as	*bring, brought.*
y (formerly g),			as	*buy, bought.*
ig=*ei*	to	*ough*,	as	*fight, fought.*
eek	to	*ough*,	as	*seek, sought.*

It must be noticed that the list above is far from being an exhaustive one. The expression too of the changes undergone has been rendered difficult on account of the imperfection of our Orthography. The whole section has been written in illustration of the meaning of the word Permutation rather than for any specific object in Grammar.

§ 89. In all the words above the change of sound has been brought about by the grammatical inflection of the word wherein it occurs. This is the case with the words *life* and *live*, and with all the rest. With the German word *leben*, compared with the corresponding word *live*, in English, the change is similar. It is brought about, however, not by a grammatical inflection, but by a difference of Time, and by a difference of Place. This indicates the distinction between the Permutation of Letters and the Transition of Letters. In dealing with Permutations we compare different parts of Speech; in dealing with Transitions we compare different languages, or different stages of a single language.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE FORMATION OF SYLLABLES.

§ 90. In respect to the Formation of Syllables, I am aware of no more than one point that requires any especial consideration.

In certain words, of more than one syllable, it is difficult to say to which syllable an intervening Consonant belongs. For instance, does the *v* in *river*, and the *e* in *fever*, belong to the first or the second syllable? Are the words to be divided thus, *ri-ver*, *fe-ver*? or thus, *riv-er*, *fev-er*?

The solution of the question lies by no means on the surface.

In the first place the case is capable of being viewed in two points of view; an Etymological, and a Phonetic one.

That the *c* and *r* in *become*, *berhymed*, &c. &c. belong to the second syllable we determine at once by taking the words to pieces; whereby we get the words *come* and *rhymed* in an isolated independent form. But this fact, although it settles the point in Etymology, leaves it as it was in Phonetics; since it in nowise follows that, because the *c* in the *simple* word *come* is exclusively attached to the letter that follows it, it is, in the *compound* word *become*, exclusively attached to it also.

To the following point of structure in the consonantal sounds the reader's attention is particularly directed.

1. Let the Vowel *a* (as in *fate*) be sounded.—2. Let it be followed by the Consonant *p*, so as to form the syllable *āp*. To form the sound of *p*, it will be found that the lips close on the sound of *a*, and arrest it. Now, if the lips be left to themselves, they will not *remain* closed on the sound, but will open again, in a slight degree indeed, but in a degree sufficient to cause a kind of vibration, or, at any rate, to allow an escape of the remainder of the current of breath by which the sound was originally formed. To reopen in a slight degree is the natural tendency of the lips in the case exhibited above.

Now, by an effort, let this tendency to reopen be counteracted. Let the remaining current of breath be cut short. We have, then, only this, *viz.* so much of the syllable *āp* as can be formed by the *closure* of the lips. All that portion of it that is caused by their re-opening is deficient. The resulting sound seems truncated, cut short, or incomplete. It is the sound of *p*, *minus* the remnant of breath. All of the sound *p* that is now left, is formed, not by the *escape* of the breath, but by the *arrest* of it.

The *p* in *āp* is a *final* sound. With initial sounds the case is different. Let the lips be *closed*, and let an attempt be made to form the syllable *pa* by suddenly opening them. The sound appears incomplete; but its incompleteness is at the *beginning* of the sound, and not at the end of it. In the natural course of things there would have been a current of breath *preceding*, and this current would have given a vibration, now wanting. All the sound that is formed here, is formed, not by the *arrest* of breath, but by the *escape* of it.

I feel that this account of the mechanism of the apparently simple sound *p*, labours under all the difficulties that attend the *description* of a sound; and for this reason I again request the reader to satisfy himself either of its

truth or its inaccuracy, before he proceeds to the conclusions that will be drawn from it.

The account, however, being recognized, we have in the current natural sound of *p* two elements:—

1st. That formed by the current of air and the closure of the lips, as in *ăp*. This may be called the sound of breath *arrested*.

2nd. That formed by the current of air and the opening of the lips, as in *pā*. This may be called the sound of breath *escaping*.

Now what may be said of *p* may be said of all the other Consonants, the words *tongue*, *teeth*, &c. &c. being used instead of *lips*, according to the case.

Let the sound of breath *arrested* be expressed by π, and that of breath *escaping* be expressed by ϖ, the two together form the current natural sound *p* ($\pi + \varpi = p$.)

Thus *ăp* (as quoted above) is $p—\varpi$, or π; whilst *pa* (sounded similarly) is $p—\varpi$, or π.

In the formation of syllables I consider that the sound of Breath Arrested belongs to the First, and the sound of Breath Escaping to the Second syllable. That each sound being expressed by a separate sign, the word *happy* is divided thus, *haπ-ϖy;* and that such is the case with all Consonants between two syllables. The *whole* Consonant belongs neither to one syllable nor the other. Half of it belongs to each. The reduplication of the *p* in *happy*, the *t* in *pitted*, &c. &c. &c. &c., is a mere point of spelling, of which more will be said in the Chapter on Orthography.

CHAPTER VI.

ON QUANTITY.

§ 91. The dependent (§ 71) Vowels, as the *a* in *fat*, *i* in *fit*, *u* in *but*, *o* in *not*, have this character; *viz.* they are all uttered with rapidity, and pass quickly in the enunciation, the voice not resting on them. This rapidity of utterance becomes more evident when we contrast with them the prolonged sounds of the *a* in *fate*, *ee* in *feet*, *oo* in *book*, *o* in *note*; wherein the utterance is retarded, and wherein the voice rests, delays, or is prolonged. The *f* and *t* of *fate* are separated by a longer interval than the *f* and *t* of *fat*; and the same is the case with *fit*, *feet*, &c. &c.

Let the *n* and the *t* of *not* be each as 1; the *o* also being as 1, then each letter, Consonant or Vowel, shall constitute $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole word.

Let, however, the *n* and *t* of *note* be each as 1, the *o* being as 2. Then, instead of each Consonant constituting $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole word, it shall constitute but $\frac{1}{4}$.

Upon the comparative extent to which the voice is prolonged the division of Vowels and Syllables into *Long* and *Short* has been established: the *o* in *note* being Long, the *o* in *not* being Short. And the Longness or Shortness of a Vowel or Syllable is said to be its Quantity.

§ 92. The division of *Vowels* into Long and Short coincides *nearly* with the division of them into Independent and

Dependent. Mark the word *Vowels*, and mark the word *nearly*. In the length and shortness of Vowels there are Degrees. This is especially the case with the Broad Vowels. The *a* in *father* is capable of being pronounced either very quickly, or very slowly. It may be uttered most rapidly and yet preserve its Broad character, *i. e.* become neither the *a* in *fat*, nor the *a* in *fate*.

In the Independence and Dependence of Vowels there are no degrees.

Subject to the views laid down in the next section, the *Vowel ee* in *seeing* is Long, and it is certainly Independent. Whether the *syllable see* be Long is another question.

The *-u* in *monument* (for further remarks on this word, see § 97,) is Short. It is not, however, Dependent.

1. All Long Vowels are Independent, but all Independent Vowels are not Long.

2. All Dependent Vowels are Short, but all Short Vowels are not Dependent.

Clear notions upon these matters are necessary for determining the Structure of the English and Classical Metres.

§ 93. The qualified manner in which it was stated that the *Vowel* in the word *seeing* was Long, and the attention directed to the word *Vowels* in § 92, arose from a distinction, that is now about to be drawn, between the Length of *Vowels* and the Length of *Syllables*.

The Independent Vowel in the Syllable *see* is Long; and Long it remains, whether it stand as it is, or be followed by a Consonant, as in *seen*, or by a Vowel, as in *see-ing*.

The Dependent Vowel in the word *sit* is Short. If followed by a Vowel it becomes unpronounceable, except as the *ea* in *seat* or the *i* in *sight* (*see* § 71). By a Consonant, however, it may be followed, and still retain its

Dependent character and also its Shortness. Such is the power it has in the word quoted, *sit*. Followed by a *second* Consonant, it still retains its Shortness, *e. g. sits*. Whatever the comparative Length of the *Syllables see* and *seen*, *sit* and *sits*, may be, the Length of their respective *Vowels* is the same.

Now if we determine the character of the Syllable by the character of the Vowel, all Syllables are Short wherein there is a Short Vowel, and all are Long wherein there is a Long one. Measured by the Quantity of the Vowel the word *sits* is Short, and the Syllable *see* in *seeing* is Long.

But it is well known that this view is not the view commonly taken of the Syllables *see* (in *seeing*) and *sits*. It is well known that, in the eyes of a Classical Scholar, the *see* (in *seeing*) is Short, and that in the word *sits* it is Long. The Classic differs from the Englishman thus,—*He measures his Quantity, not by the Length of the Vowel but, by the Length of the Syllable taken altogether.* The perception of this distinction enables us to comprehend the following statements.

I. That Vowels Long by nature may *appear* to become Short by position, and *vice versâ*.

II. That, by a laxity of language, the *Vowel* may be said to have changed its Quantity, whilst it is the *Syllable* alone that has been altered.

III. That, if one person measures his Quantities by the Vowels, and another by the Syllables, what is Short to the one, shall be Long to the other, and *vice versâ*. The same is the case with Nations.

IV. That one of the most essential differences between the English and the Classical Languages is that the Quantities (as far as they go) of the first are measured by the Vowel, those of the latter by the Syllable. To a Roman

the word *monument* consists of two Short Syllables and one Long one; to an Englishman it contains three Short Syllables.

These remarks will be appreciated when we consider the comparative characters of the Classical and the English Prosody.

CHAPTER VII.

ON ACCENT.

§ 94. In the word *tyrant* there is an emphasis, or stress, upon the first syllable. In the word *presume* there is an emphasis, or stress, on the second syllable. This emphasis, or stress, is called *Accent.* The circumstance of a syllable bearing an accent is sometimes expressed by a mark (′); in which case the word is said to be accentuated, *i. e.* to have the accent signified in writing.

Words accented on the last syllable. *Brigáde, preténce, harpoón, reliéve, detér, assúme, besoúght, beréft, befóre, abroád, abóde, abstrúse, intermíx, superádd, cavaliér.*

Words accented on the last syllable but one. *An′chor, ar′gue, hásten, fáther, fóxes, smíting, húsband, márket, vápour, bárefoot, Archángel, bespátter, disáble, terrífic.*

Words accented on the last syllable but two. *Régular, an′tidote, for′tify, suscéptible, incontrovértible.*

Words accented on the last syllable but three (rare). *Réceptacle, régulating, tálkativeness, ábsolutely, lúminary, inévitable,* &c.

A great number of words are distinguished by the accent alone. The following list is from Nares' Orthoepy, a work to which the reader is referred.

An *A'ttribute.*	To *attríbute.*
The month *Áugust.*	An *augúst* person.
A *Com'pact.*	*Compáct* (close).
To *con'jure* (magically).	*Conjúre* (enjoin).
Des'ert, wilderness.	*Desért,* merit.
Inválid, not valid.	*Invalíd,* a sickly person.
Mínute, 60 seconds.	*Minúte,* small.
Súpine, part of speech.	*Supíne,* careless, &c. &c.

That class of words that by a change of accent are converted from Nouns into Verbs (*súrvey, survéy, cóntrast, contrást,* &c. &c.) will be noticed more at large in the Chapter of Derivation, Part III.

§ 95. In words like *thínking, fóxes, lon'ger, len'gthen,* &c. (as in the word *Smiðum,* &c. § 32,) we have two parts; first the original word, the root, or the radical part, as *think, fox, long, length,* &c. &c.; and next, the inflectional, or the subordinate part, *-ing, -es, -er, -en,* &c. &c.

To assert as a universal rule that the *accent is always on the root, and never on the subordinate part of a word,* is too much. Although in the *English* language such an assertion (with one exception) is found true, by the French and other languages it is invalidated.

In words like *len'g-then-ing,* we have a *second* inflectional or subordinate syllable; and the accent remains in its original place, *absolutely, but not relatively. It is all the farther from the end of the word.* Besides indicating the propriety of determining the place of the accent by counting from the end, rather than the beginning of a word, this circumstance indicates something else.

Imagine the English Participles to be declined, and to possess Cases, formed by the addition of fresh syllables. In this case the word *len'gthening* would become a quadrisyllable. But to throw the accent to the fourth syllable from the end is inconvenient. Hence a necessity of re-

moving it from the radical, and placing it on an inflectional syllable.

The German word *lében* (to *live*) illustrates the foregoing sentence. *Léb-* is the root, *léb-end* = *living*, from whence *lebéndig* = *lively* (with the accent on an inflectional syllable), although this last word might without inconvenience have been accented on the first syllable; that being only the third from the end.

Confusion between the radical and inflectional syllables of a word, arising from the situation of the accent, may work the deterioration of a language.

§ 96. In *týrant* and *presúme*, we deal with single words; and in each *word* we determine which *syllable* is accented. Contrasted with the sort of accent that follows, this may be called a *Verbal* Accent.

In the line,

> Better for *us*, perhaps, it might appear,
> (Pope's *Essay on Man*, i. 169,)

the Pronoun *us* is strongly brought forward. An especial stress or emphasis is laid upon it, denoting that *there are other beings to whom it might not appear*, &c. &c. This is collected from the context. Here there is a *Logical* Accent. "When one word in a sentence is distinguished "by a stress, as more important than the rest, we may say "that it is *emphatical*, or that an *emphasis* is laid upon it. "When one syllable in a word is distinguished by a stress, "and more audible than the rest, we say that it is accented, "or that an accent is put upon it. Accent, therefore, is to "syllables what emphasis is to sentences; it distinguishes "one from the crowd, and brings it forward to observa-"tion."—(Nares' Orthoepy, Part II. Chap. I.)

§ 97. Accent plays an important part in determining the nature of certain compound words. For this, see the Chapter on Composition.

It also plays an important part in determining the nature of the English Metres. See Prosody.

Thirdly, (the subject of the present section,) it plays an important part in all systems of Orthography.

The quotation from Professor Lee's Hebrew Grammar, in § 71, is referred to; and a particular attention to a somewhat difficult subject is requisite.

The *u* in the word *monument* is what a Classic would call *short.*

The second *syllable* in the word *monument* is what a Classical Scholar would call *short.* The Vowel is *short,* and the syllable taken altogether is *short.* Herein it agrees with the first syllable *mon-*. It differs, however, from the syllable *mon-* in being destitute of an accent, *mónument.* With the third syllable *-ment,* it agrees in the eyes of an Englishman, but differs in the eyes of a Scholar. The Vowels *u* and *e* are equally short, and, as the Englishman measures by the Vowel (*see* § 93), the syllables *-u* and *-ment* are both *short.* Not so, however, with the Scholar. He measures by the syllable (*see* § 93), and determines that the *e,* although naturally a short Vowel, is made *long* by position. However, in being each destitute of an accent the syllables *-u* and *-ment* agree. Be it remarked a second time that the accent in *mónument* lies on the first syllable.

Now the *-u* in *mónument* although *short,* is not *dependent* (*see* §§ 91, 71).

If, however, the syllable *-nu* take an accent; that is, if the place of the accent be removed from the first to the second syllable, the Vowel *u* still being kept Short, we have a word which we spell thus, *monumment.* Now the *u* in *monumment* is not only Short, but Dependent. It is upon this effect of an accent that the quotation from Lee's Hebrew Grammar (§ 71) especially bears.

And now two questions arise:—1. How is it that the accent has the effect of rendering such a syllable as the *u* in *monumment* dependent? 2. Why do we in spelling such a syllable double the Consonant?

An accent falling upon a syllable must, of necessity, do one of two things: it must affect the Vowel, or it must affect the Consonant. If it affect the Vowel, the Vowel becomes the predominant part of the syllable, as in *monóoment;* but, if it affect the Consonant, the Consonant becomes the predominant part of the syllable, as *monum'ment.*

In words like *monumment* the Consonant is, strictly speaking, as single as it is in *monument*, or *monooment.* Its *absolute* sound is the same. Not so its *relative* sound. This is exaggerated by two circumstances:—1st. The comparative shortness of Vowel *u;* 2nd. the fact of the accent falling on it. The increased relative importance of the letter *m* in the word *monumment* is mistaken for a reduplication of the sound. This is the reason why in most Languages the shortness of a Vowel is expressed by the doubling of the Consonant following; this doubling being no true reduplication of the sound, but a mere orthographical conventionality.

§ 98. Accent and Quantity, as may have been collected from § 97, do *not* coincide. Nothing shows this more clearly than words like the Adjective *augúst*, and the Substantive *Áugust* (the month), where the Quantity remains the same, although the Accent is different. The following quotation from Mr. Guest's English Rhythms is made for the sake of four things:—

1st. Of showing that the generality of writers have the credit of confusing Accent with Quantity.

2nd. Of showing that there is a reason for such a confusion having existed.

3rd. Of indicating the propriety of the expressions in italics. It is not stated that the Consonant *c* is doubled, but that it is added to the first syllable. The difference lies, not in its reduplication, but in its distribution.

4th. Of taking a slight exception. A syllable (accented or unaccented) must be either Independent or Dependent; if the latter, then in most immediate contact with the Consonant that follows.

"Besides the increase of loudness, and the sharper tone which dis-
"tinguishes the accented syllable, there is also a tendency to dwell upon
"it, or, in other words, to lengthen its quantity. We cannot increase
"the loudness or the sharpness of a tone without a certain degree of
"muscular action: and to put the muscles in motion requires time.
"It would seem that the time required for producing a perceptible
"increase in the loudness or sharpness of a tone is greater than that of
"pronouncing some of our shorter syllables. If we attempt, for in-
"stance, to throw the accent on the first syllable of the word *become*, we
"must either lengthen the Vowel, and pronounce the word *bee-come*, or
"*add the adjoining Consonant to the first syllable, and so pronounce the*
"*word bec-ome*. We often find it convenient to lengthen the quantity
"even of the longer syllables, when we wish to give them a very strong
"and marked accent. Hence, no doubt, arose the vulgar notion, that
"Accent always lengthens the Quantity of a syllable.

"It is astonishing how widely this notion has misled men, whose
"judgement, in most other matters of criticism, it would be very unsafe
"to question. Our earlier writers, almost to a man, confound Accent
"with Quantity."—B. i. C. iv.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ORTHOEPY.

§ 99. THE present Chapter is one, not upon the details of the Pronunciation of the English Language, but upon the Principles of Orthoepy. For the details of Pronunciation the reader is referred to Nares' Orthoepy, and to the common Pronouncing Dictionaries, with the preliminary recommendation to use them with caution. *Orthoepy*, a word derived from the Greek *orthon* (*upright*), and *epos* (*a word*), signifies the right utterance of words. Orthoepy differs from Orthography by determining how words are spoken, whereas Orthography decides how they are spelt. The one is a question of speech, the other a question of spelling. Orthography presupposes Orthoepy.

§ 100. Of Pronunciation there are two kinds, the Colloquial and the Rhetorical. In common conversation we pronounce the *i* in *wind*, like the *i* in *bit;* in rehearsing, or in declamation, however, we pronounce it like the *i* in *bite;* that is, we give it a diphthongal sound. In reading the Scriptures we say *blesséd;* in current speech we say *blest.* It is the same with many words occurring in poetry.

§ 101. Errors in Pronunciation are capable of being classified. In the first place, they may be arranged according to their situation. The man who pronounces the Verb *to survéy*, as if it was *súrvey*, (that is, with the accent on the wrong syllable,) errs in respect to the accentuation

of the word; the situation, or seat of his error, being the accent. To say *orātor* instead of *orător* is (subject to the remarks of § 103) to err in respect to quantity of the word, the seat of the error being in the quantity; and to pronounce the *a* in *father*, as it is pronounced in Yorkshire, or the *s* in *sound*, as it is pronounced in Devonshire (that is, as *z*), is to err in the matter of the articulate sounds. To mispronounce a word because it is misspelt * is only indirectly an error of Orthoepy. It is an error, not so much of Orthoepy, as of Orthography; and to give a wrong inflection to a word is not bad Pronunciation but bad Grammar. For practical purposes, however, many words that are really points of Grammar and of Orthography, may be dealt with as points of Orthoepy. This will be the case with the two words quoted in § 105. II.

That the preceding classification is natural I am induced to believe by the following circumstances. Errors in the way of articulation generally arise from a source different from those of accent and of quantity. Errors in accent and quantity are generally referrible to insufficient grammatical or etymological knowledge, whilst the errors of articulation betray a provincial dialect.

The Misdivision of Syllables, an orthoepical error of a fourth kind, has in the English, and perhaps in other languages, given rise to a peculiar class of words. There have been those who have written *a nambassador*, for *an ambassador*, misdividing the syllables, and misdistributing the sound of the letter *n*. The double form (*a* and *an*) of the English Indefinite Article encourages this misdivision. Now, in certain words an error of this kind has had a permanent influence. The English word *nag* is, in Danish, *øg;* the *n*, in English, having originally belonged to the

* To say, for instance, *Chemist* for *Chymist*, or *vice versâ;* for I give no opinion as to the proper mode of spelling.

Indefinite *an*, which preceded it. The words, instead of being divided thus, *an ag*, were divided thus, *a nag*, and the fault became perpetuated. That the Danish is the true form we collect, firstly, from the ease with which the English form is accounted for, and, secondly, from the Old Saxon form *ehu*, Latin *equus*. In *adder* we have the process reversed. The true form is *nadder*, Old English; *Natter*, German. Here the *n* is taken from the Substantive and added to the Article. In *newt* and *eft* we have each form. The list of words of this sort can be increased.

§ 102. In the second place, faults of pronunciation may be arranged according to their cause.

1. *The fault of incompetent enunciation.* A person who says *sick* for *thick*, or *elebben* for *eleven*, does so, not because he knows no better, but because he cannot enounce the right sounds of *th* and *v*. He is *incompetent* to it. His error is not one of ignorance. It is an acoustic or a phonetic defect. As such it differs from,

2. *The fault of erroneous enunciation.*—This is the error of a person who talks of *jocholate* instead of *chocolate*. It is not that he *cannot* pronounce rightly, but that he mistakes the nature of the sound required. Still more the person who calls *a hedge an edge*, and *an edge a hedge*.

§ 103. Incompetent enunciation, and erroneous enunciation are, however, only the proximate and immediate causes of bad Orthoepy. Amongst the remote causes (the immediate causes of *erroneous* enunciation) are the following.

I. *Undefined notions as to the language to which a word belongs.*—The flower called *anemone* is variously pronounced. Those who know Greek say *anemōne*, speaking as if the word was written *anemohny*. The mass say, *anemŏne*, speaking as if the word was written *anemmony*.

Now, the doubt here is as to the language of the word. If it be Greek, it is *anemōne.*

Αἷμα ῥοδὸν τίκτει, τα δὲ δάκρυα τᾶν Ανεμῶναν.

Bion.

And if it be English, it is, (on the score of analogy,) as undoubtedly *anemone.* The pronunciation of the word in point is determined when we have determined the language of it.

II. *Mistakes as to fact, the language of a word being determined.*—To know the word *anemōne* to be Greek, and to use it as a Greek word, but to call it *anemŏny,* is not to be undecided as to a matter of language, but to be ignorant as to a matter of quantity.

III. *Neglect of Analogy.*—Each and all of the following words, *orator, theatre, senator,* &c. &c. are in the Latin language, from whence they are derived, accented on the second syllable; as *orátor, theátre, senátor.* In English, on the contrary, they are accented on the first; as *órator, théatre, sénator.* The same is the case with many other words similarly derived. They similarly suffer a change of accent. So many words do this, that it is the rule in English for words to throw their accent from the second syllable (counting from the end of the word) to the third. It was on the strength of this rule,—in other words, on the analogies of *orator,* &c. &c., that the English pronunciation of the Greek word Ανεμώνη was stated to be *Anemŏny.* Now, to take a word derived from the Latin, and to look to its original quantity only, without consulting the analogies of other words similarly derived, is to be neglectful of the analogies of our own language, and attentive to the quantities of a foreign one.

These, amongst others, the immediate causes of erroneous enunciation, have been adduced not for the sake of exhausting, but for the sake of illustrating the subject.

§ 104. In matters of Orthoepy it is the usual custom to appeal to one of the following standards.

I. *The authority of Scholars.*—This is of value up to a certain point only. The fittest person for determining the classical pronunciation of a word like *anemone* is the Classical Scholar; but the mere Classical Scholar is far from being the fittest person to determine the analogies that such a word follows in English.

II. *The usage of educated bodies, such as the Bar, the Pulpit, the Senate,* &c. &c.—These are recommended by two circumstances: 1st. The chance that each member of them is sufficiently a scholar in foreign tongues to determine the original pronunciation of derived words, and sufficiently a critic in his own language to be aware of the analogies that are in operation. 2nd. The quantity of imitators that, irrespective of the worth of his pronunciation, each individual can carry with him. On this latter ground the Stage is a sort of standard.

The objection to the authority of educated bodies is its impracticability. It is only the usage of the component individuals that can be determined. Of these many may carry with them the dialects of their provinces, so that, although good standards on points of accent and quantity, they are bad ones upon points of articulation.

III. *The authority of Societies constituted with the express purpose of taking cognizance of the Language of the country.*—These, although recognized in Italy and other parts of the Continent, have only been proposed in Great Britain. Their inefficacy arises from the inutility of attempting to fix that which, like language, is essentially fluctuating.

IV. *The authority of the written Language.*—The value of this may be collected from the Chapter on Orthography.

V. These, amongst others, the standards that have been appealed to, are adduced not for the sake of exhausting the

subject, but to show the unsatisfactory nature of authority in matters of speech.

§ 105. For a person, on a point of pronunciation, to trust to his own judgment, he must be capable, with every word that he doubts about, of discussing three questions:—

I. The Abstract or Theoretical Propriety of a given Pronunciation.—To determine this he must have a sufficient knowledge of foreign tongues and a sufficient knowledge of English analogies. He must also have some test by which he can determine to what language an equivocal word belongs. Of tests for this purpose one, amongst others, is the following. Let it be asked whether the word *lens* (in Optics) is English or Latin; whether it is to be considered as a naturalized word or a strange one. The following fact will give an answer. There is of the word *lens* a Plural Number, and this Plural Number is the English form *lenses*, and not the Latin form *lentes*. The existence of an English Inflection proves that the word to which it belongs is English, although its absence does not prove the contrary. That the word *anemone* is English (and consequently pronounced *anemŏne*) we know from the Plural form, which is not *anemonæ*, but *anemones*.

II. The preference of one Pronunciation over another on the score of Utility.—The word *ascetic*, for certain orthographical reasons, notwithstanding its origin from the Greek word *askeô*, is called *assetic*. From similar reasons there is a tendency to call the word *sceptic*, *septic*. Theoretical propriety (and, be it observed, the analogy of *ascetic* has not been overlooked) is in favour of the word being sounded *skeptic*. The tendency of language, however, is the other way. Now the tendency of language and the theoretical propriety being equal, there is an advantage (a point of utility) in saying *skeptic*, which turns the scale. By sounding the *k* we distinguish the word *skeptic* from *septic*. By

this the language gains a point in perspicuity, so that we can talk of the *anti-skeptic* writings of Bishop Warburton and of the *anti-septic* properties of charcoal.

III. The Tendencies of Language.—From §§ 77, 78, we see that the combination *ew* is an Unstable Combination, that it has a tendency to become *yoo*, and that the *y* in *yoo* has a tendency to change a *d* preceding into *j*; in other words, we see the reason why, by many persons, *dew* is pronounced *jew*.

It is generally an easier matter to say how a word will be sounded a hundred years hence, than to determine its present pronunciation. Theoretical propriety is in favour of *dew*, so also is the view in the way of utility. Notwithstanding this, posterity will say *jew*, for the tendencies of language are paramount to all other influences.

We may now judge of the relative value of the three lines of criticism exhibited above. Other things being equal, the Language should have the advantage of the doubt, and the utility of a given pronunciation should prevail over its theoretical propriety. Where, however, the tendencies are overwhelming, we can only choose whether, in doubtful words, we shall speak like our ancestors, or like our posterity.

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 106. ORTHOEPY determines the correct pronunciation of words, and deals with a language as it is *spoken;* Orthography determines the correct spelling of words, and deals with a language as it is *written.* The term is derived from the Greek words *orthos* (*upright*), and *graphé*, or *grafæ* (*writing*). Orthography is less essential to language than Orthoepy; since all languages are spoken, whilst but a few languages are written. Orthography presupposes Orthoepy. Orthography addresses itself to the eye, Orthoepy to the ear. Orthoepy deals with the articulate sounds that constitute syllables and words; Orthography treats of the signs by which such articulate sounds are expressed in writing. A *letter* is the sign of an articulate (and in the case of *h*, of an inarticulate) sound.

A full and perfect System of Orthography consists in two things:—1. The possession of a full and consistent alphabet; 2. The right application of such an alphabet. This position may be illustrated more fully.

§ 107. First, in respect to a full and perfect alphabet. Let there be, in a certain language, simple single articulate sounds, to the number of forty, whilst the simple single signs, or letters, expressive of them, amount to no more than *thirty.* In this case the alphabet is insufficient. It is not full enough: since ten of the simple single arti-

culate sounds have no corresponding signs whereby they may be expressed. In our own language the sounds (amongst others) of *th* in *thin*, and of *th* in *thine*, are simple and single, whilst there is no sign equally simple and single to spell them with.

An alphabet, however, may be full and sufficient, and yet imperfect. It may err on the score of inconsistency. Let there be in a given language two simple single sounds; for instance, the *p* in *pate*, and the *f* in *fate*. Let these sounds stand in a given relation to each other. Let a given sign, for instance, ב (as is actually the case in Hebrew), stand for the *p* in *pate;* and let a second sign be required for the *f* in *fate*. Concerning the nature of this latter sign two views may be taken. One framer of the alphabet, perceiving that the two sounds are mere modifications of each other, may argue that no new sign (or letter) is at all necessary, but that the sound of *f* in *fate* may be expressed by a mere modification of the sign (or letter) ב, and may be written thus ב, or thus ב′, or ב', &c. &c. &c.; allied sounds being expressed by allied signs. The other framer of the alphabet, contemplating the difference between the two sounds, rather than the likeness, may propose, not a mere modification of the sign ב, but a letter altogether new, such as *f*, or ף, &c. &c. &c.; sounds of a given degree of dissimilitude being expressed by signs of a different degree of dissimilitude. Hitherto the expression of the sounds in point is a matter of convenience only. No question has been raised as to its consistency or inconsistency. This begins under conditions like the following. Let there be in the language in point the sounds of the *t* in *tin*, and of the *th* in *thin;* which (it may be remembered) are precisely in the same relation to each other as the *p* in *pate* and *f* in *fate*. Let each of these sounds have a sign (or letter) expressive

of it. Upon the nature of these signs, or letters, will depend the nature of the sign or letter required for the *f* in *fate*. If the letter expressing the *th* in *thin* be a mere modification of the letter expressing the *t* in *tin*, then must the letter expressive of the *f* in *fate* be a mere modification of the letter expressing the *p* in *pate*, and *vice versâ*. If this be not the case, the alphabet is inconsistent. In the English alphabet we have (amongst others) the following inconsistency. The sound of the *f* in *fate*, in a given relation to the sound of the *p* in *pate*, is expressed by a totally distinct sign; whereas the sound of the *th* in *thin* (similarly related to the *t* in *tin*,) is expressed by no new sign, but by a mere modification of *t*; viz. *th*.

A third element in the faultiness of an alphabet is the fault of Erroneous Representation. The best illustration of this we get from the Hebrew alphabet, where the sounds of ת and ט, mere *varieties* of each other, are represented by distinct and dissimilar signs, whilst ת and ת, sounds *specifically* distinct, are expressed by a mere modification of the same sign, or letter.

The fault of Redundancy will be noticed in p. 153.

§ 108. *The right application of an alphabet.*—An alphabet may be both sufficient and consistent, accurate in its representation of the alliances between articulate sounds, and in no wise redundant; and yet, withal, it may be so wrongly applied as to be defective. Of defect in the use or application of the letters of an alphabet, the three main causes are the following.

1st. *Unsteadiness in the power of letters.*—Of this there are two kinds. In the first, there is one sound with two (or more) ways of expressing it. Such is the sound of the letter *f* in English. In words of Anglo-Saxon origin it is spelt with a single simple sign, as in *fill*; whilst in Greek words it is denoted by a combination, as in

Philip. The reverse of this takes place with the letter *g;* here a single sign has a double power; in *gibbet* it is sounded as *j,* and in *gibberish* as *g* in *got.*

2nd. *The aim at secondary objects.*—The natural aim of Orthography, of Spelling, or of Writing (for the three terms mean the same thing), is to express the *sounds* of a language. Syllables and words it takes as they meet the ear, it translates them by appropriate signs, and so paints them, as it were, to the eye. That this is the natural and primary object is self-evident; but beyond this natural and primary object there is, with the orthographical systems of most languages, a secondary one, *viz.* the attempt to combine with the representation of the sound of a given word the representation of its history and origin.

The sound of the *c,* in *city,* is the sound that we naturally spell with the letter *s,* and if the expression of this sound was the *only* object of our orthographists, the word would be spelt accordingly (*sity*). The following facts, however, traverse this simple view of the matter. The word is a derived word; it is transplanted into our own language from the Latin, where it is spelt with a *c* (*civitas*); and to change this *c* into *s* conceals the origin and history of the word. For this reason the *c* is retained, although, as far as the mere expression of sounds (the primary object in Orthography) is concerned, the letter is a superfluity. In cases like the one adduced the Orthography is bent to a secondary end, and is traversed by the Etymology.

3rd. *Obsoleteness.*—It is very evident that modes of spelling which at one time may have been correct, may, by a change of pronunciation, become incorrect; so that Orthography becomes obsolete whenever there takes place a change of speech without a correspondent change of spelling.

§ 109. *Difference between the change of a sound and the*

original false expression of a sound.—The letter *u* is a simple single sign. The sound of *ow*, in *town*, is a diphthongal, or a double sound. Now, in Anglo-Saxon, the modern word *town* is spelt *tún*. In this case one of two things must have taken place: either the word must have changed its sound, or the Anglo-Saxons must have expressed it falsely and improperly. This distinction bears upon the questions of Appendix B.

§ 110. From the foregoing sections we arrive at the Theory of a full and perfect Alphabet and Orthography, of which a few (amongst many others) of the chief conditions are as follows:—

1. That for every simple single sound, incapable of being represented by a combination of letters, there be a simple single sign.

2. That sounds within a determined degree of likeness be represented by signs within a determined degree of likeness; whilst sounds beyond a certain degree of likeness be represented by distinct and different signs, *and that uniformly.*

3. That no sound have more than one sign to express it.

4. That no sign express more than one sound.

5. That the primary aim of Orthography be to express the sounds of words, and not their histories.

6. That changes of speech be followed by corresponding changes of spelling.

With these principles in our mind, we may measure the imperfections of our own and of other alphabets.

§ 111. Previous to considering the Sufficiency or Insufficiency of the English Alphabet, it is necessary to enumerate the elementary articulate sounds of the language. The enumeration of these is, strictly speaking, a point, not of Orthography, but of Orthoepy. It is, however, so intimately connected with the former that the present Chapter

seems its proper place. The Vowels belonging to the English Language are the *twelve* following:—

1.	That of	*a*	in	*father.*	7.	That of	*e*	in	*bed.*
2.	—	*a*	—	*fat.*	8.	—	*i*	—	*pit.*
3.	—	*a*	—	*fate.*	9.	—	*ee*	—	*feet.*
4.	—	*aw*	—	*bawl.*	10.	—	*u*	—	*bull.*
5.	—	*o*	—	*not.*	11.	—	*oo*	—	*fool.*
6.	—	*o*	—	*note.*	12.	—	*u*	—	*duck.*

For the relations of these see Chapter II.

The Diphthongal Sounds are *four.*

1.	That of	*ou*	in	*house.*
2.	—	*ew*	—	*new*
3.	—	*oi*	—	*oil.*
4.	—	*i*	—	*bite.*

This last sound being most incorrectly expressed by the single letter *i.*

The Consonantal Sounds are, 1. the two Semivowels; 2. the four Liquids; 3. fourteen out of the sixteen Mutes; 4. *ch* in *chest,* and *j* in *jest,* Compound Sibilants; 5. *ng,* as in *king*; 6. the aspirate *h.* In all, twenty-four.

1.	*w*	as in	*wet.*	13. *th*	as in *thin.*
2.	*y*	—	*yet.*	14. *th*	— *thine.*
3.	*m*	—	*man.*	15. *g*	— *gun.*
4.	*n*	—	*not.*	16. *k*	— *kind.*
5.	*l*	—	*let.*	17. *s*	— *sin.*
6.	*r*	—	*run.*	18. *z*	— *zeal.*
7.	*p*	—	*pate.*	19. *sh*	— *shine.*
8.	*b*	—	*ban.*	20. *z*	— *azure, glazier.*
9.	*f*	—	*fan.*	21. *ch*	— *chest.*
10.	*v*	—	*van.*	22. *j*	— *jest.*
11.	*t*	—	*tin.*	23. *ng*	— *king.*
12.	*d*	—	*din.*	24. *h*	— *hot.*

Some writers would add to these the additional sound of the *é fermé* of the French; believing that the Vowel in

words like *their* and *vein* has a different sound from the Vowel in words like *there* and *vain*. For my own part I cannot detect such a difference either in my own speech or that of my neighbours; although I am far from denying that in certain *dialects* of our language such may have been the case. The following is an extract from the Danish Grammar for Englishmen, by Professor Rask, whose eye, in the matter in question, seems to have misled his ear. "The *é fermé*, or *close é*, is very frequent in Danish, but "scarcely perceptible in English; unless in such words as, "*their*, *vein*, *veil*, which appear to sound a little different "from *there*, *vain*, *vale*." § 3.

The Vowels being twelve, the Diphthongs four, and the Consonantal Sounds twenty-four, we have altogether as many as forty sounds, some being so closely allied to each other as to be mere modifications, and others being combinations rather than simple sounds; all, however, agreeing in requiring to be expressed by letters or by combinations of letters, and to be distinguished from each other.

Now, although every sound specifically distinct (§ 72) should be expressed by a distinct sign, it does not follow that mere modifications or varieties (especially if they be within certain limits) should be so expressed. In the Greek language sounds as like as the *o* in *not* and the *o* in *note* are expressed by signs as unlike as ο and ω; that is, by the letters *Omicron* and *Omega* respectively; and so it is with ε and η. All that can be said in this case is, that it is the character of the Greek alphabet to represent a difference which the English neglects.

With respect to the Diphthongs it is incorrect, uncommon, and inconvenient to represent them by simple single signs, rather than by combinations. In the English language the sounds of *ou*, *ew*, and *oi*, are properly spelt with

two letters. Not so, however, of *i* in *bite*, of which more will be said in Appendix B.

The Compound Sibilants may also be expressed not by single signs, but by the combinations *tsh* and *dzh*; although, for certain reasons, such a mode of spelling is inconvenient. With these views we may appreciate,

I. *The Insufficiency of the English Alphabet.*

A. *In respect to the Vowels.*—Notwithstanding the fact that the sounds of the *a* in *father*, *fate*, and *fat*, and of the *o* and the *aw*, in *note*, *not*, and *bawl*, are modifications of *a* and *o*, respectively, we have still *six* Vowel Sounds specifically distinct, for which (*y* being a Consonant rather than a Vowel) we have but *five* signs. The *u* in *duck*, specifically distinct from the *u* in *bull*, has no specifically distinct sign to represent it.

B. *In respect to the Consonants.*—The *th* in *thin*, the *th* in *thine*, the *sh* in *shine*, the *z* in *azure*, and the *ng* in *king*, five sounds specifically distinct, and five sounds perfectly simple, require corresponding signs; which they have not.

II. *Its Inconsistency.*—The *f* in *fan*, and the *v* in *van*, sounds in a certain degree of relationship to *p* and *b*, are expressed by signs as unlike as *f* is unlike *p*, and as *v* is unlike *b*. The sound of the *th* in *thin*, the *th* in *thine*, the *sh* in *shine*, similarly related to *t*, *d*, and *s*, are expressed by signs as like *t*, *d*, and *s*, respectively, as *th* and *sh*.

The compound sibilant sound of *j* in *jest* is spelt with the single sign *j*, whilst the compound sibilant sound in *chest* is spelt with the combination *ch*.

III. *Erroneousness.*—The sound of the *ee* in *feet* is considered the Long (Independent) sound of the *e* in *bed*; whereas it is the Long (Independent) sound of the *i* in *pit*.

The *i* in *bite* is considered as the Long (Independent) sound of the *i* in *pit*; whereas it is a diphthongal sound.

The *u* in *duck* is looked upon as a modification of the *u* in *bull*; whereas it is a specifically distinct sound.

The *ou* in *house* and the *oi* in *oil* are looked upon as the compounds of *o* and *i* and of *o* and *u* respectively; whereas the latter element of them is not *i* and *u*, but *y* and *w*.—See § 68.

The *th* in *thin* and the *th* in *thine* is dealt with as one and the same sound; whereas they are sounds specifically distinct.

The *ch* in *chest* is dealt with as a modification of *c* (either with the power of *k* or of *s*); whereas its elements are *t* and *sh*.

IV. *Redundancy.*—As far as the representation of sounds is concerned the letter *c* is superfluous. In words like *citizen* it may be replaced by *s*; in words like *cat* by *k*. In *ch*, as in *chest*, it has no proper place. In *ch*, as in *mechanical*, it may be replaced by *k*.

Q is superfluous, *cw* or *kw* being its equivalent.

X also is superfluous, *ks*, *gz*, or *z*, being equivalent to it.

The diphthongal forms *æ* and *œ*, as in *Æneas* and *Crœsus*, except in the way of Etymology, are superfluous and redundant.

V. *Unsteadiness.*—Here we have (amongst many other examples), 1. The Consonant *c* with the double power of *s* and *k*; 2. *g* with its sound in *gun* and also with its sound in *gin*; 3. *x* with its sounds in *Alexander*, *apoplexy*, *Xenophon*.

In the foregoing examples a single sign has a double power; in the words *Philip* and *fillip*, &c. &c. a single sound has a double sign.

In respect to the degree wherein the English Ortho-

graphy is made subservient to Etymology, it is sufficient to repeat the statement that the *c*, *æ*, and *œ* are retained in the alphabet for etymological purposes only.

The defects noticed in the preceding sections are *absolute* defects, and would exist, as they do at present, were there no language in the world except the English. This is not the case with those that are now about to be noticed; for them, indeed, the word *defect* is somewhat too strong a term. They may more properly be termed inconveniences.

Compared with the languages of the rest of the world, the use of many letters in the English Alphabet is *singular*. The letter *i* (when Long or Independent) is, with the exception of England, generally sounded as *ee*. With Englishmen it has a diphthongal power. The inconvenience of this is the necessity that it imposes upon us, in studying foreign languages, of unlearning the sound which we give it in our own, and of learning the sound which it bears in the language studied. So it is (amongst many others) with the letter *j*. In English this has the sound of *dzh*, in French of *zh*, and in German of *y*. From singularity in the use of letters arises inconvenience in the study of foreign tongues.

In using *j* as *dzh* there is a second objection. It is not only inconvenient, but it is theoretically incorrect. The letter *j* was originally a modification of the Vowel *i*. The Germans, who use it as the Semivowel *y*, have perverted it from its original power less than the English have done, who sound it *dzh*.

With these views we may appreciate, of the English Alphabet and Orthography,

I.) *Its Convenience or Inconvenience in respect to learning Foreign Tongues.*—The sound given to the *a* in *fate* is singular. Other nations sound it as *a* in *father*.

The sound given to the *e*, Long (or Independent),

is singular. Other nations sound it either as *a* in *fate*, or as *é fermé*.

The sound given to the *i* in *bite* is singular. Other nations sound it as *ee* in *feet*.

The sound given to the *oo* in *fool* is singular. Other nations sound it as the *o* in *note*, or as the *ó chiuso*.

The sound given to the *u* in *duck* is singular. Other nations sound it as the *u* in *bull*.

The sound given to the *ou* in *house* is singular. Other nations, more correctly, represent it by *au* or *aw*.

The sound given to the *w* in *wet* is somewhat singular, but is also correct and convenient. With many nations it is not found at all, whilst with those where it occurs it has the sound (there or thereabouts) of *v*.

The sound given to *y* is somewhat singular. In Danish it has a Vowel power. In German the Semivowel sound is spelt with *j*.

The sound given to *z* is not the sound which it has in German and Italian; but its power in English is convenient and correct.

The sound given to *ch* in *chest* is singular. In other languages it has generally a guttural sound; in French that of *sh*. The English usage is more correct than the French, but less correct than the German.

The sound given to *j* (as said before) is singular.

II.) *The Historical Propriety of certain Letters.*—The use of *i* with a diphthongal power is not only singular and inconvenient, but also historically incorrect. The Greek *Iota*, from whence it originates, has the sound of *i* and *ee*, as in *pit* and *feet*.

The *y*, sounded as in *yet*, is historically incorrect. It grew out of the Greek υ, a Vowel, and no Semivowel. The Danes still use it as such, that is, with the power of the German *ü*.

The use of *j* for *dzh* is historically incorrect.

The use of *c* for *k* in words derived from the Greek, as *mechanical*, *ascetic*, &c. &c. is historically incorrect. The form *c* is the representative of *γ* and *σ* (see Chap. X.), and not of the Greek *Kappa*.

In remodelling alphabets the question of historical propriety should be recognized. Other reasons for the use of a particular letter in a particular sense being equal, the historical propriety should decide the question. The above examples are illustrative, not exhaustive.

§ 112. *On certain conventional modes of Spelling.* — In the Greek language the sounds of *o* in *not* and of *o* in *note* (although allied) are expressed by the unlike signs or letters *ο* and *ω*, respectively. In most other languages the difference between the sounds is considered too slight to require for its expression signs so distinct and dissimilar. In some languages the difference is neglected altogether. In many, however, it is expressed, and that by some modification of the original letter.

Let the sign ¯ denote that the Vowel over which it stands is Long, or Independent, whilst the sign ˘ indicates Shortness, or Dependence. In such a case, instead of writing *not* and *nωt*, like the Greeks, we may write *nŏt* and *nōt*, the sign serving for a fresh letter. Herein the expression of the nature of the sound is natural, because the natural use of ¯ and ˘ is to express Length or Shortness, Dependence or Independence. Now, supposing the Broad sound of *o* (see § 71) to be already represented, it is very evident that, of the other two sounds of *o*, the one must be Long (Independent), and the other Short (Dependent); and as it is only necessary to express one of these conditions, we may, if we choose, use the sign ¯ alone; its presence denoting Length, and its absence Shortness (Independence or Dependence).

As signs of this kind, one mark is as good as another; and instead of ¯ we may, if we choose, substitute such a mark as ′ (and write *nót* = *nŏt* = *nœt* = *nŏte*); provided only that the sign ′ expresses no other condition or affection of a sound. This use of the mark ′ *viz.* as a sign that the Vowel over which it is placed is Long (Independent), is common in many languages. But is this use of ′ natural? For a reason that the reader has anticipated, it is not natural, but conventional. It is used elsewhere not as the sign of *Quantity*, but as the sign of *Accent;* consequently, being placed over a letter, and being interpreted according to its natural meaning, it gives the idea, not that the syllable is Long, but that it is emphatic or accented. Its use as a sign of Quantity is an orthographical expedient, or a conventional mode of spelling.

The English language abounds in orthographical expedients; the mode of expressing the Quantity of the Vowels being particularly numerous. To begin with these:

The reduplication of a Vowel where there is but one syllable (as in *feet*, *cool*), is an orthographical expedient. It merely means that the syllable is Long (or Independent).

The juxta-position of two different Vowels, where there is but one syllable (as in *plain*, *moan*), is an orthographical expedient. It generally means the same as the reduplication of a Vowel, *i. e.* that the syllable is Long (Independent).

The addition of the *e* mute, as in *plane*, *whale*, (whatever may have been its origin) is, at present, but an orthographical expedient. It denotes the lengthening of the syllable.

The reduplication of the Consonant after a Vowel, as in *spotted*, *torrent*, is in most cases but an orthographical

expedient. It merely denotes that the preceding Vowel is Short (Dependent).

The use of *Ph* for *f* in *Philip*, is an orthographical expedient, founded upon etymological reasons.

The use of *th* for the simple sound of the first Consonant in *thin* and *thine*, is an orthographical expedient. The combination must be dealt with as a single letter.

X, however, and *Q* are not orthographical expedients. They are orthographical compendiums.

The above instances have been adduced as illustrations only. Further details will be found in § 114. For many of them we can give a reason (for instance, for the reduplication of a Consonant to express the shortness of the preceding Vowel), and of many of them we can give a historical account (see Chapter X.).

§ 113. The mischief of orthographical expedients is this:—When a sign, or letter, is used in a *conventional*, it precludes us from using it (at least without further explanation) in its *natural* sense: *e. g.* the two *oo's* in *mood* constitute but one syllable. If in a foreign language we had, immediately succeeding each other, first the syllable *mo*, and next the syllable *od*, we should have to spell it *mo-od*, or *möod*, or *mo-o͡d*, &c. &c. Again, it is only by our knowledge of the language that the *th* in *nuthook*, is not pronounced like the *th* in *burthen*. In the languages of India the true sound of *t* + *h* is common. This, however, we cannot spell naturally because the combination *th* conveys to us another notion. Hence such combinations as *thh*, or *t'*, &c. &c. in writing Hindoo words.

A second mischief of orthographical conventionalities, is the wrong notions that they engender, the eye misleading the ear. That *th* is really *t* + *h*, no one would have believed had it not been for the spelling.

§ 114. The present section is the partial application of

the preceding observations. It is a running commentary upon the Orthographical Part of Dr. Johnson's Grammar. Presuming a knowledge of the detail of the English Orthography, it attempts an explanation of some of its leading characters. Many of these it possesses in common with other tongues. Several are peculiar to itself.

"*A*, sounded as *aw*, or as a modification of *o*."—*A*, as in *father*, and *o*, as in *note*, (as may be seen in § 65,) form the extremities of the Vowel System. Notwithstanding this, the two sounds often interchange. The orthographical systems of most languages bear witness to this. In French the *au* in *autel* has the sound of *o*; in Danish *aa* = *o* (*baade* being pronounced *bohde*); in Swedish *å* has the same power. In Old English the forms *hond*, *strond*, &c. &c. occur, instead of *hand*, *strand*, &c. &c. In A. S. *brád*, *stán*, &c. &c. correspond to the English forms *broad*, *stone*. I am not able to say whether *a* changes oftenest to *o*, or *o* to *a*. The form *hond* is older than the form *hand*. In the word *salt*, however, the *a* was pronounced as the *a* in *fat* before it was pronounced (as at present) like the *o* in *not*. If this were not the case, it would never have been spelt with an *a*. In the words *launch* and *haunch*, by some called *lanch*, *hanch*, and by others, *lawnch*, *hawnch*, we find a present tendency to interchange these sounds. Whether the Saxon mode of spelling *brád*, *stán*, &c. &c. arose from the sound being that of *a*, and being mistaken for that of *o*; or whether the sound was really, in the time of the Anglo-Saxons, a sound of *o*, since changed, will be considered in Appendix B.

The change from *a* to *o* takes place most especially before the Liquid *l*, *wall*, *call*, *fall*. When the Liquid *l* is followed by another Consonant it (*viz. l*) is generally sunk in pronunciation, *falcon*, *salmon*, &c. &c., pronounced

faucon, sammon, or *saumon.* The reason of this lies in the following fact, *viz. that syllables wherein there are, at the same time, two final Consonants and a long Vowel, have a tendency to become shortened by one of two processes, viz. either by ejecting one of the Consonants, or by shortening the Vowel.* That the *l* in *falcon* is affected not by the change of *a* to *o,* but by the change of a Short Vowel to a Long, or of a Slender one to a Broad one, is shown in the tendency which the common people have to say *hode* for *hold,* as well as by the Scotch form *gowd* for *gold.* This fact bears upon the difficult problem in the Greek (and in other languages), *viz.* whether the *lengthening* of the Vowel, in words like ὦδᾶς (compared with ὄδοντος), is the cause or the effect of the rejection of the Consonant.

" *E* is long, as in *scene;* or short, as in *cellar.*"—*Johnson.* It has been stated before that the (so-called) Long Sound of *e* is non-existent, and the *e* in *scene,* is the (so-called) Long Sound of the *i* in *pit.*

For the power of *e* in *since* and *once,* see the remarks on *s.*

For the power of *e* in *hedge* and *oblige,* see the remarks on *g.*

The power of *e* Mute in words like *cane, bane, tune, robe, pope, fire, cure, tube,* has been noticed in p. 157. It serves to denote the length of the preceding Vowel. For this purpose it is retained; but it was not for this purpose that it was invented. Originally it expressed a sound, and it is only by a change of language that it has come, as it were by accident, to be an orthographical expedient.

Let a word consist of two syllables. Let the latter end in a Vowel. Let there be between the Vowel of the first and the Vowel of the second syllable, one Consonant and no more, *e. g. Namæ.* Let the Consonant belong to the

root of the word; and let the first syllable of the word be the essential and the radical part of it. Let this same syllable (as the essential and radical part of it) have an accent. The chances are that, under such circumstances, the Vowel of the first syllable will be Long (Independent), just as the chances are that a Vowel followed by two Consonants will be Short. Let a change in language affect the *final* Vowel, so that a word which was originally pronounced *nama*, should become, first, *namë*, and afterwards *nām*, *naim*, or *næm*; the Vowel being sounded as the *a* in *fate*. Let the final *e*, although lost in pronunciation, be retained in the spelling. The chances are that, the above conditions being given, such an *e* (final and mute) shall, whenever it occurs, occur at the end of a long syllable. The next process is for a succeeding generation to mistake a coincidence for a sign, and to imagine that an *e* Mute expresses the length of syllable.

I consider this to be the key to the use of the *e* Mute in all words where it is preceded by one Consonant only.

From the circumstance that the French and the English are the only nations wherein the *e* Mute is part and parcel of the Orthography, it has been hastily imagined that the employment of it is to be attributed to the Norman Conquest. The truth, however, is, that we find it equally in words of Saxon and of Norman origin.

The fact that, in certain words, an *e* Mute is preceded by two Consonants and by a Short Vowel, does not militate against the view given above.

"*I* has a sound, long, as in *fine*, and short, as in *fin*. "That is eminently observable in *i*, which may be likewise "remarked in other letters, that the short sound is not "the long sound contracted, but a sound wholly different." —*Johnson*. This extract has been made in order to add the authority of Johnson to the statement so often repeated

already; *viz.* that the *i* in *bite* is not the long sound of the *i* in *bit.*

For the sound of *u* in *guest*, *prorogue*, *guard*, see the remarks on *g*.

As a Vowel, *y* is wholly superfluous. It is a current remark that more words end in *y* (*fortify*, *pretty*,) than in any other letter. This is true only in respect to their spelling. As a matter of *speech*, the *y* final has always the sound either of the *ee* in *feet*, or of the *i* in *bite*. Such is the case with the words *fortify* and *pretty*, quoted above. For some reason or other the Vowel *e* is never, in English, written at the end of words, unless when it is mute; whilst *i* is never written at all. Instead of *cri*, we write *cry*, &c. &c. This is a peculiarity of our Orthography, for which I have no satisfactory reason. It *may* be, that with words ending in *e*, *y* is written for the sake of showing that the Vowel is not mute, but sounded. Again, the Adjectives ending in *y*, as *any*, and the Adverbs in *ly*, as *manly*, in the older stages of our language ended, not in *y*, but in *ig* (*manlig*, *ænig*); so that the present *y*, in such words, may be less the equivalent of *i* than the compendium of *ig*. I venture this indication with no particular confidence.

The *b* in *debtor*, *subtile*, *doubt*, agrees with the *b* in *lamb*, *limb*, *dumb*, *thumb*, *womb*, in being mute. It differs, however, in another respect. The words *debtor*, *subtle*, *doubt*, are of classical, the words *lamb*, *limb*, *dumb*, &c. &c. are of Saxon origin. In *debtor*, &c. &c. the *b* was, undoubtedly, at one time, pronounced, since it belonged to a different syllable; *debitor*, *subtilis*, *dubito*, being the original forms. I am far from being certain that with the other words, *lamb*, &c. &c. this was the case. With them the *b* belonged (if it belonged to the word at all) to the same syllable as the *m*. I think, however, that instead of this being the

case, the *b*, in *speech*, never made a part of the word at all; that it belongs now, and that it always belonged, to the *written* language only; and that it was inserted in the spelling upon what may be called the Principle of Imitation. For proofs of this, see the remarks on the word *could*.

"*Ch* has a sound which is analysed into *tsh*, as *church*, "*chin*, *crutch*. *C* might be omitted in the language without "loss, since one of its sounds might be supplied by *s*, "and the other by *k*, but that it preserves to the eye the "Etymology of words, as *face* from *facies*, *captive* from "*captivus*." — *Johnson*. Quoted for the sake of adding authority to the statements of § 69. Before *a*, *o*, *u*, (that is, before a full Vowel,) *c* is sounded as *k*; before *e*, *i*, and *y*, (that is, before a small Vowel,) it has the power of *s*. This change of sound according to the nature of the Vowel following, is so far from being the peculiarity of the English, that it is common in all languages; except that sometimes *c*, instead of becoming *s*, becomes *ts*, *tsh*, *ksh*, in other words, some other Sibilant; *but always a Sibilant*. A reference to § 78 will explain this change. At a given time, *k* (written *c*, as is the case in Latin) becomes changed by the Vowel following (see § 78) into *ksh*, and from thence into *s*, *ts*, or *tsh*. That the syllables *cit*, *cyt*, *cet*, were at one time pronounced *kit*, *kyt*, *ket*, we believe: 1. from the circumstance that if it were not so, they would have been spelt with an *s*; 2. from the comparison of the Greek and Latin languages, where the words *cete*, *circus*, *cystis*, Latin, are κητῆ, κίρκος, κύστις, Greek.

In the words *mechanical*, *choler*, &c. &c. derived from the Greek, it must not be imagined that the *c* represents the Greek *Kappa* or κ. The combination *c* + *h* is to be dealt with as a single letter. Thus it was that the Romans, who

had in their language neither the sound of χ, nor the sign x, rendered the Greek *chi* (χ), just as by *th* they rendered θ, and by *ph*, φ.

The faulty representation of the Greek χ has given rise to a faulty representation of the Greek x, as in *ascetic*, from ἀσκήτικος. For further remarks on this word, see § 105.

"*C*, according to the English Orthography, never ends "a word; therefore we write *stick*, *block*, which were origin- "ally *sticke*, *blocke*. In such words *c* is now mute."—*Johnson*. Just as there was a prejudice against *i* or *e* ending a word (see above), there seems to have been one in the case of *c*. In the word *Frederick* there are three modes of spelling: 1. Frederic; 2. Frederik; 3. Frederick. Of these three it is the last only that seems, to an Englishman, natural. The form Frederic seems exceptionable, because the last letter is *c*, whilst Frederik is objected to because *k* comes in immediate contact with the Short Vowel.

Now the reason against *c* ending a word seems this. From what has been remarked above, *c* seems, in and of itself, to have no power at all. Whether it shall be sounded as *k* or as *s* seems undetermined, except by the nature of the Vowel following. If the Vowel following be small, *c* = *s*, if full, *c* = *k*. But *c* followed by nothing is equivocal and ambiguous. Now *c* final is *c* followed by nothing; and therefore *c* equivocal, ambiguous, indefinite, undetermined. This is the reason why *c* is never final. Let there be such words as *sticke* and *blocke*. Let the *k* be taken away. The words remain *stice*, *bloce*. The *k* being taken away, there is a danger of calling them *stise*, *blose*.

A verbal exception being taken, the statement of Dr. Johnson, that in words like *stick* and *block* the *k* is mute, is objectionable. The mute letter is not so much the *c* as the *k*.

" *G* at the end of a word is always hard, as *ring, sing.*" —*Johnson.* A verbal exception may be taken here. *Ng*, as stated in § 70, is not a combination of the sounds of *n*+*g*, but the representation of a simple single sound; so that, as in the case of *th* and *sh*, the two letters must be dealt with as a single one.

" *G* before *n* is mute, as *gnash, sign, foreign.*"—*Johnson.* The three words quoted above are not in the same predicament. In words like *gnash* the *g* has been silently dropped on the score of Euphony (see remarks on *k*); in *sign* and *foreign* the *g* has not been dropped, but changed. It has taken the allied sound of the Semivowel *y*, and so, with the preceding Vowel, constitutes a Diphthong.

Before *a, o, u* (full Vowels), *g* has the sound, as in *gay, go, gun:* before *e, i, y*, that of *gem, giant.* For the reason of this see § 78. At the end of a word (that is, followed by nothing at all,) or followed by a Consonant, it has the same sound that it has before *a, o, u*— *agog, grand.* This shows that such is its natural sound. In *hedge* and *oblige* the *e* mute serves to show that the *g* is to be pronounced as *j*.

Let there be the word *rŏg.* Let the Vowel be lengthened. Let this lengthening be expressed by the addition of *e* mute, *roge.* There is now a risk of the word being called *roje.* This is avoided by inserting *u*, as in *prorogue.* Why, however, is it that the *u* runs no chance of being pronounced, and the word of being sounded *prorogwé?* The reason for this lies in three facts. 1. The affinities between the sounds of *ga* and *ka.* 2. The fact that *qu* is merely *kw.* 3. The fact that in *qu*, followed by another Vowel, as in *quoit* (pronounced *koyt*), *antique*, &c. the *u* is altogether omitted in pronunciation. In other words, the analogy of *qu* is extended to *gu.*

For the varied sounds of *gh* in *plough tough, enough,*

(*enow*), *through*, remember that the original sound of *gh* was a hard guttural, as is at present the case in Scotland, and between *g*, *h*, *f*, *v*, *w*, there are frequent interchanges.

"*H* is a note of aspiration."—It is under the notion that *th*, *ph*, *sh*, as in *thin*, *thine*, *Philip*, *shine*, are aspirated sounds, that *h* is admitted in the spelling. As has been repeatedly stated, *th*, *ph*, *sh* are to be treated as single signs or letters.

"*J*, consonant, sounds uniformly like the soft *g* (*i. e.* as " in *gem*), and is, therefore, a letter useless, except in Ety- " mology, as *ejaculation*, *jester*, *jocund*, *juice*."—*Johnson.* It may be added that it never occurs in words of Saxon origin, and that in the single word *Allelujah* it has the sound of *y*, as in the German.

K never comes before *a*, *o*, *u*, or before a Consonant. It is used before *e*, *i*, *y*, where *c* would, according to the English analogy, be liable to be sounded as *s*; as in *kept*, *king*, *skirt*. These words, if written *cept*, *cing*, *scirt*, would run the risk of being sounded *sept*, *sing*, *sirt*. Broadly speaking, *k* is never used except where *c* would be inconvenient. The reason of this lies in the fact of there being no such letter as *k* in the Latin language. Hence arose in the eyes of the Etymologist the propriety of retaining, in all words derived from the Latin (*crown*, *concave*, *concupiscence*, &c. &c.), the letter *c*, to the exclusion of *k*. Besides this, the Anglo-Saxon Alphabet, being taken from the Roman, excluded *k*, so that *c* was written even before the small Vowels, *a*, *e*, *i*, *y*; as *cyning*, or *cining*, *a king*. *C* then supplants *k* upon etymological grounds only. In the languages derived from the Latin this dislike to the use of *k* leads to several orthographical inconveniences. As the tendency of *c*, before *e*, *i*, *y*, to be sounded as *s* (or as a sound allied to *s*), is the same in those languages as in

others; and as in those languages, as in others, there frequently occur such sounds as *kit*, *ket*, *kin*, &c. &c. a difficulty arises as to the spelling. If spelt *cit*, *cet*, &c. there is the risk of their being sounded *sit*, *set*. To remedy this, an *h* is interposed—*chit*, *chet*, &c. &c. This, however, only substitutes one difficulty for another, since *ch* is, in all probability, already used with a different sound, *e. g.* that of *sh*, as in French, or that of *k* guttural, as in German. The Spanish Orthography is thus hampered. Unwilling to spell the word *chimera* (pronounced *kimera*) with a *k;* unable to spell it with either *c* or *ch*, it writes the word *quimæra*. This distaste for *k* is an orthographical prejudice. Even in the way of Etymology it is but partially advantageous, since in the other Gothic languages, where the Alphabet is less rigidly Latin, the words that in English are spelt with a *c*, are there written with *k*, — *kam*, Ger.; *komme*, Dan.; *skrapa*, Sw.: = *came*, *come*, *scrape*.

The use of *k* final, as in *stick*, &c. &c. has been noticed above.

" *Skeptic*, for so it should be written, not *sceptic*."—*Johnson*. Quoted for the sake of adding authority to the statement made in § 105, *viz.* that the Greek *Kappa* is to be represented not by *c*, but by *k*.

" *K* is never doubled, but *c* is used before it to shorten " the Vowel by a double Consonant, as *cŏckle*, *pĭckle*."—*Johnson*. This is referrible to the statement that *k* is never used where *c* is admissible.

" *K* is used before *n*, *knell*, *knot*, but totally loses its " sound."—*Johnson*. This, however, is not the case in the allied languages; in German and Danish, in words like *knecht*, *knive*, the *k* is sounded. This teaches us that such was once the case in English. Hence we learn that in the words *knife*, *knight*, (and also in *gnaw*, *gnash*,) we have an antiquated or obsolete Orthography.

For the ejection of the sound of *l* in *calf*, *salmon*, *falcon*, &c. &c. see under *a*. For the *l* in *could*, see that word.

"*N* is sometimes mute after *m*, as *damn*, *condemn*, "*hymn*."—*Johnson*. In all these words the *n* originally belonged to a succeeding syllable, *dam-no*, *condem-no*, *hym-nus*.

Q, accurately speaking, is neither a letter, nor an abbreviation. It is always followed by *u*, as *queen*, *quilt*, and the two letters *qu* must be looked upon as a single sign, equivalent to (but scarcely an abbreviation) of *kw*. *Q* is not = *k* alone. The combination *qu*, is never sounded *koo*. Neither is *kw*. If it were so, there would be in the word *queen* (currently speaking) *three* sounds of *u*, *viz*. two belonging to *q* (= *kw*), and one belonging to *u* itself. *W* being considered as = 2 *u* : $q = k + \frac{1}{2} w$. This view of *q* bears upon the theory of words like *prorogue*, &c. &c.

The reader is referred to Chapter III. There he is told that, when a word ends in a Flat Consonant, *b*, *v*, *d*, *g*, the Plural termination is not the sound of *s*, but that of *z* (*stagz*, *dogz*); although *s* be the letter *written*. Such also is the case with words ending in the Vowels or the Liquids (*peaz*, *beanz*, *hillz*, not *peace*, *beance*, *hillce*). This fact influences our Orthography. The majority of words ending in *s* are found to be Plural Numbers, or else (what is the same thing in respect to form) either Genitive Cases, or Verbs of the Third Person Singular; whilst in the majority of these the *s* is sounded as *z*. Hence, the inference from analogy that *s* single, at the end of words, is sounded as *z*. Now this fact hampers the Orthography of those words wherein *s* final retains its natural sound, as *since*, *once*, *mass*, *mace*; for let these be written *sins*, *ons*, *mas*, the chances are that they will be pronounced *sinz*, *onz*, *maz*. To remedy this, the *s* may be doubled, as in *mass*. This, however, can be done in a few cases only. It cannot be done conveniently where

the Vowel is long, the effect of a double Consonant being to denote that the preceding Vowel is short. Neither can it be done conveniently after a Consonant, such combinations as *sinss*, &c. &c. being unsightly. This throws the Grammarian upon the use of *c*, which, as stated above, has, in certain situations, the power of *s*. To write, however, simply *sinc*, or *onc*, would induce the risk of the words being sounded *sink*, *onk*. To obviate this *e* is added, which has the double effect of not requiring to be sounded (being mute), and of showing that the *c* has the sound of *s* (being small). For the application of this see the words *pence* and *dice* in § 139.

"It is the peculiar quality of *s* that it may be sounded "before all Consonants, except *x* and *z*, in which *s* is com- "prised, *x* being only *ks*, and *z* only a hard [flat] or gross "*s*. This *s* is therefore termed by Grammarians *suæ potes-* "*tatis litera*, the reason of which the learned Dr. Clarke "erroneously supposed to be, that in some words it might "be doubled at pleasure."—*Johnson*. A reference to the current Greek Grammars will indicate another reason for σ being called *suæ potestatis litera*. It will there be seen that, whilst π, β, φ—κ, γ, χ—τ, δ, θ—are grouped together as *Tenues*, *Mediæ*, and *Aspiratæ*, and as *inter se cognatæ*, σ stands by itself; ζ its *Media* (flat sound) being treated as a double letter, and *sh*, its so-called Aspirate, being non-existent in the Greek language.

The sound of *ti* before a Vowel, as in *salvation*, is explained by § 78.

"*Th* has two sounds; the one soft [flat], as *thus*, "*whether*; the other hard [sharp], as *thing*, *think*. The "sound is soft [flat] in all words between two Vowels, "as *father*, *whether*; and between *r* and a Vowel, as *bur-* "*then*."—*Johnson*. The reason of the latter statement lies in the fact of both the Vowels and *r* being *flat* (see

§ 63), and so exerting a flattening influence upon the sounds in contact with them.

In the Substantives *breath* and *cloth*, the *th* is sharp (*i. e.* as *th* in *thin*); in the Verbs *breathe* and *clothe*, the *th* is flat (*i. e.* as *th* in *thine*). That a great number of Substantives may be made Verbs by changing the sound of their final Consonant, may be seen in § 94. However, with the words *breathe* and *clothe*, a second change has taken place, *viz.* the Vowel has been lengthened. Now of these two changes, *viz.* the lengthening of the Vowel, and the flattening of the Consonant, which is the one represented by the *e* Mute, in *clothe* and *breathe*, as compared with *cloth* and *breath?* I imagine the former. Hence an exception is taken to the following statement of Dr. Johnson:—"When it (*th*) is softened [flattened] at the end "of a word, an *e* silent must be added, as *breath*, *breathe*, "*cloth*, *clothe*."

The sounds of the *s* in *sure*, of the *t* in *picture* (when pronounced *pictshure*), and of the *z* in *azure* and *glazier*, are explained in § 78.

The present Chapter is intended not to exhaust the list, but to illustrate the character of those orthographical expedients which insufficient Alphabets, changes in Language, and the influences of Etymology engender both in the English and in other Tongues.

CHAPTER X.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ENGLISH ALPHABET.

§ 115. The preceding Chapter has exhibited the Theory of a full and perfect Alphabet; it has shown how far the English Alphabet falls short of such a standard; and, above all, it has exhibited the various conventional modes of spelling which the insufficiency of Alphabets, combined with other causes, has engendered. The present Chapter gives a *history* of our Alphabet, whereby many of its defects are *accounted for.* These defects, it may be said, once for all, the English Alphabet shares with those of the rest of the world, although, with the doubtful exception of the French, it possesses them in a higher degree.

With very few exceptions, (the Chinese, the Hieroglyphic, the Corean? the Cherokee? the Burmese? and a few others,) all the modes of writing in the world originate, directly or indirectly, from the Phœnician, Hebrew, or Semitic Alphabet. This is easily accounted for when we call to mind,—1. The fact that the Greek, the Latin, and the Arabian Alphabets are all founded upon this; and, 2. The great influence of the nations speaking those three languages. The present sketch, however, is given only for the sake of accounting for defects.

§ 116. *Phœnician, Hebrew, or Semitic Period.* — At a

given period the Alphabet of Palestine, Phœnicia, and the neighbouring languages of the Semitic Tribe, consisted of twenty-two separate and distinct letters. For these see the Hebrew Grammars and the Phœnicia of Gesenius.

The chances are that, let a language possess as few elementary articulate sounds as possible, an Alphabet of only twenty-two letters will be insufficient. Now, in the particular case of the languages in point, the number of elementary sounds, as we know from the present Arabic, was above the average. It may safely be asserted, that the original Semitic Alphabet was *insufficient* for even the Semitic Languages.

It was, moreover, *inconsistent:* since sounds as like as those of *Teth* and *Tau* (mere variations of each other) were expressed by signs as unlike as ט and ת; whilst sounds as unlike as those of *Beth* with a point, and *Beth* without a point (*b* and *v*), were expressed (if expressed at all) by signs as like as ב and בּ.

In this state it was imported into Greece. Now, as it rarely happens that any two languages have precisely the same elementary articulate sounds, so it rarely happens that an Alphabet can be transplanted from one tongue to another, and be found, at once, to coincide.

The Greeks had, in probability, sounds which were wanting in Palestine and Phœnicia. In Palestine and Phœnicia it is certain that there were sounds wanting in Greece.

Of the twenty-two Phœnician Letters the Greeks took but twenty-one. The eighteenth letter, *Tsadi*, צ, was never imported into Europe.

§ 117. *Greek Period.*—Compared with the Semitic, the *Old* Greek Alphabet ran thus:—

	Hebrew.	*Greek.*		*Hebrew.*	*Greek.*
1.	א	A.	13.	מ	M.
2.	ב	B.	14.	נ	N.
3.	ג	Γ.	15.	ס	Σ?
4.	ד	Δ.	16.	ע	O.
5.	ה	E.	17.	פ	Π.
6.	ו	*F.*	18.	צ	—
7.	ז	Z.			
8.	ח	H.	19.	ק	A letter called Koppa, afterwards ejected.
9.	ט	Θ.			
10.	י	I.	20.	ר	P.
11.	כ	K.	21.	ש	M. afterwards Σ?
12.	ל	Λ.	22.	ת	T.

Such the order and form of the Greek and Hebrew Letters. Here it may be remarked, that, of each Alphabet, it is only the modern forms that are compared; the likeness in the *shape* of the letters may be seen by comparing them in their older stages. Of these the exhibition, in a work like the present, is inconvenient. They may, however, be studied in the work already referred to, *Gesenii Phœnicia.* The *names* of the Letters are as follows:—

	Hebrew.	*Greek.*		*Hebrew.*	*Greek.*
1.	Aleph	Alpha.	12.	Lamed	Lambda.
2.	Beth	Bæta.	13.	Mem	Mu.
3.	Gimel	Gamma.	14.	Nun	Nu.
4.	Daleth	Delta.	15.	Sameeh	Sigma?
5.	He	E, *psilon.*	16.	Ayn	O.
6.	Vaw	*Digamma.*	17.	Pi	Phi.
7.	Zayn	Zæta.	18.	Tsadi	——
8.	Heth	Hæta.	19.	Kof	Koppa, *Archaic.*
9.	Teth	Thæta.	20.	Resh	Rho.
10.	Yod	Iôta.	21.	Sin	San, *Doric.*
11.	Kaph	Kappa.	22.	Tau	Tau.

The Asiatic Alphabet of Phœnicia and Palestine is now adapted to the European Language of Greece. The first

change took place in the manner of writing. The Orientals wrote from right to left; the Greeks from left to right. Besides this, the following principles, applicable whenever the Alphabet of one language is transferred to another, were recognised:—

1. Letters for which there was no use were left behind. This was the case, as seen above, with the eighteenth letter, *Tsadi*.

2. Letters expressive of sounds for which there was no precise equivalent in Greek, were used with other powers. This was the case with letters 5. 8. 16. and probably with some others.

3. Letters of which the original sound, in the course of time, became changed, were allowed, as it were, to drop out of the Alphabet. This was the case with 6. and 19.

4. For such simple single elementary articulate sounds as there was no sign or letter representant, new signs, or letters, were invented. This principle gave to the Greek Alphabet the new signs ϕ, χ, υ, ω.

5. The new signs were not mere modifications of the older ones, (as was the case with ם, ם, ב, ב, &c. &c. in Hebrew,) but new, distinct, and independent letters.

In all this there was an improvement. The faults of the newer Greek Alphabet consisted in the admission of the compendium ψ=*ps*, and the retention of the fifteenth letter (*Samech*, *Xi*), with the power of *ks*: it being also a compendium.

§ 118. *The Italian or Latin Period.*—That it was either from the original Phœnician, or from the *Old* Greek, that the Italian Alphabets were imported, we learn from the existence in them of the letters *f* and *q*, corresponding respectively to the sixth and nineteenth letters: these having, in the second stage of the Greek Alphabet, been ejected.

The first Alphabet imported into Italy was the Etruscan. In this the B, Δ, and O, were ejected, their sounds (as it is stated) not being found in the Etruscan Language. Be it observed, that the sounds, both of B and Δ are *flat*. Just as in the Devonshire dialect the flat sounds (*z*, *v*, &c.) have the preponderance, so, in the Etruscan, does there seem to have been a preponderating quantity of the sharp sounds. This prepares us for a change, the effects whereof exist in almost all the Alphabets of Europe. In Greek and Hebrew the third letter (*Gimel, Gamma,*) had the power of the flat mute *g*, as in *gun*. In the Etruscan it had the power of *k*. In this use of the third letter the Romans followed the Etruscans; but as they had also in their language the sound of *g* (as in *gun*), they used, up to the Second Punic War, the third letter (*viz. c*) to denote both sounds. In the Duillian column we have MACESTRATOS. CARTHACINIENSES.* Afterwards, however, the separate sign (or letter) *g* was invented, being originally a mere modification of *c*. The *place* of *g* in the Alphabet is involved in the history of *z*.

The Roman Alphabet had a double origin. For the first two centuries after the Foundation of the City the Alphabet used was the Etruscan, derived directly from the Greek, and from the *Old* Greek. This accounts for the presence of *f* and *q*.

Afterwards, however, the Romans modified their Alphabet by the Alphabet of the Italian Greeks; these Italian Greeks using the late Greek Alphabet. This accounts for the presence of *v*, originating in the Greek *Ypsilon*.

In accommodating the Greek Alphabet to their own language, the Latins recognised the following principles:—

I. To eject such letters as were not wanted. Thus it

* Gesenius, p. 73.

was that the seventh letter (*Zayn*, *Zæta*,) was thrown out of the Alphabet, and the new letter, *g*, put in its place. Subsequently, *z* was restored, for the sake of spelling Greek words, but was placed at the end of the Alphabet. Thus also it was, that *Thæta*, *Kappa*, (*c* being equivalent to *k*,) and the fifteenth letter, were ejected, while ψ and χ were never admitted. In after-times the fifteenth letter (now *xi*) was restored, for the same reason that *z* was restored, and, like *z*, was placed at the end of the Alphabet.

II. To use the imported letters with a new power. Hence the sixth letter took the sound, not of *v* or *w*, but of *f*, and the eighth of *h*.

Beyond this the Romans made but slight alterations. In ejecting *Kappa*, *Thæta*, and *Chi* they did mischief. The same in changing the power of *c*. The representation of φ by *ph*, and of θ by *th* was highly erroneous. The retention of *x* and *g* was unnecessary. *V* and *j*, two letters whereby the Alphabet was really enriched, were mere modifications of *u* and *i* respectively. *Y* also seems a modification of *v*.

Neither the Latin, Greek, nor Hebrew Orthographies are much warped to etymological purposes.

It should be observed, that in the Latin, the letters have no longer Names (like *Beth*, *Bæta*), except such as are derived from their Powers (*be*, *ce*).

It may now be seen that with a language containing such sounds as the *th* in *thin* and *thine*, and the *ch* in the German *auch*, it is to their advantage to derive their Alphabet from the Greek; whilst, with a language containing such sounds as *h* and *v*, it is to their advantage to derive it from the Latin.

It may also be seen that without due alterations and additions, the Alphabet of one country will not serve as the Alphabet of another.

§ 119. *The Mœso-Gothic Alphabet.*)—In the third century the Classical Alphabets were applied to a Gothic Language. I use the word Alphabets because the Mœso-Gothic Letters are borrowed from both the Latin and the Greek. Their form and order may be seen in Hickes' Thesaurus and in Lye's Grammar. With the Greek they agree in the following particulars.

1. In the sound of the third letter being not that of κ (*c*), but of the *g* in *gun.*

2. In retaining *Kappa* and *Chi.*

3. In expressing the simple single sound of *th* by a simple single sign. This sign, however, has neither the shape nor alphabetical position of the Greek *Thœta.*

With the Latin they agree, 1. in possessing letters equivalent to *f, g, h, q, y.*

2. In placing *z* at the end of the Alphabet.

The Mœso-Gothic Alphabet seems to have been formed on eclectic principles, and on principles sufficiently bold. Neither was its application traversed by etymological views. I cannot trace its influence, except, perhaps, in the case of the Anglo-Saxon letters þ and ƿ, upon any other Alphabet; nor does it seem to have been acted upon by any earlier Gothic Alphabet.

§ 120. *The Anglo-Saxon Alphabet.*) — What sort of an Alphabet the Gothic Languages possess we know: what sort of Alphabet they require, we can determine. For the following sounds (amongst others) current in the Gothic, either one or both of the Classical Languages are deficient in corresponding signs.

1. The *th* in *thin.* A sign in Greek (θ), but none in Latin.

2. The *th* in *thine.* A sign neither in Greek nor Latin.

3. The *ch* in the German *auch.* A sign in Greek (χ), but none in Latin.

4. The flat sound of the same, or the probable sound of the *h* in *þurh*, *leoht*, &c. &c., A. S. A sign neither in Greek nor Latin.

5. The *sh* in *shine*. A sign neither in Greek nor Latin.

6. The *z* in *azure*. A sign neither in Greek nor Latin.

7. The *ch* in *chest*. A sign neither in Greek nor Latin, unless we suppose that at the time when the A. S. Alphabet was formed, the *c* in words like *civitas* had the power, which it has in the present Italian, of *ch*.

8. The *j* in *jest*. A sign neither in Greek nor Latin, unless we admit the supposition in respect to *g*, that has been indicated in respect to *c*.

9. The sound of the *kj* in the Norwegian *kjenner*, *viz.* that (thereabouts) of *ksh*. A sign neither in Latin nor Greek.

10. The English sound of *w*. A sign neither in Latin nor Greek.

11. The sound of the German *ü*, Danish *y*. No sign in Latin; probably one in Greek, *viz.* υ.

12. Signs for distinguishing the Long and Short Vowels, as ε and η, ο and ω; wanting in Latin, but existing in Greek.

In all these points the Classical Alphabets (one or both) were deficient. To make up for their insufficiency one of two things was necessary, either to coin new letters, or to use conventional combinations of the old.

In the A. S. Alphabet (derived from the Latin) we have the following features:

1. *C* used to the exclusion of *k*.

2. The absence of the letter *j*, either with the power of *y*, as in German, of *zh*, as in French, or of *dzh*, as in English.

3. The absence of *q*, a useful omission; *c* serving instead.

4. The absence of *v; u*, either single or double, being used instead.

5. The use of *y* as a Vowel, and of *e* as *y*.

6. The absence of *z*.

7. Use of *uu*, as *w*, or *v*: Old Saxon.

8. The use, in certain conditions, of *f* for *v*.

9. The presence of the simple single signs þ and ð, for the *th* in *thin*, and the *th* in *thine*.

For further notice of the A. S. Alphabet and Orthography, see Appendix B.

Of the A. S. Alphabet we may safely say that it was *insufficient*. The points wherein the Latin Alphabet was improved in its adaptation to the Gothic tongues, are, 1. the admission of þ and ð; 2. the evolution of *w* out of *u*. Upon this latter circumstance I make the following extract from the Latin Dedication of Otfrid's Krist:—
" Hujus enim linguæ barbaries, ut est inculta et indisci-
" plinabilis, atque insueta capi regulari freno grammaticæ
" artis, sic etiam in multis dictis scriptu est difficilis prop-
" ter literarum aut congeriem, aut incognitam sonoritatem.
" Nam interdum tria *u u u* ut puto quærit in sono; priores
" duo consonantes, ut mihi videtur, tertium vocali sono
" manente." And further, in respect to other orthographical difficulties:—" Interdum vero nec *a*, nec *e*, nec *i*,
" nec *u*, vocalium sonos præcanere potui; ibi *y* Grecum
" mihi videbatur ascribi. Et etiam hoc elementum lingua
" hæc horrescit interdum; nulli se characteri aliquotiens
" in quodam sono nisi difficile jungens. *K* et *z* sæpius
" hæc Lingua extra usum Latinitatis utitur; quæ Gram-
" matici inter litteras dicunt esse superfluas. Ob stri-
" dorem autem dentium interdum ut puto in hac Lingua *z*
" utuntur, *k* autem propter faucium sonoritatem."

§ 121. *The Anglo-Norman Period.*)—Between the Latin Alphabet, as applied to the Anglo-Saxon, and the Latin

Alphabet, as applied to the Norman-French, there are certain points of difference. In the first place, the sound-system of the languages (like the French) derived from the Latin, bore a greater resemblance to that of the Romans, than was to be found amongst the Gothic tongues. Secondly, the Alphabets of the languages in point were more exclusively Latin. In the present French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, there is an exclusion of the *k*. This is not the case with the Anglo-Norman. Like the Latins, the Anglo-Normans considered that the sound of the Greek θ was represented by *th:* not, however, having this sound in their language, there was no corresponding sign in their Alphabet. The greatest mischief done by the Norman influence was the ejection from the English Alphabet of þ and ð. In other respects the Alphabet was improved. The letters *z*, *k*, *j*, were either imported or more currently recognized. The letter *y* took a Semi-vowel power, having been previously represented by *e;* itself having the power of *i*. The mode of spelling the Compound Sibilant with *ch* was evolved. My notions concerning this mode of spelling are as follows: — At a given period the sound of *ce* in *ceaster*, originally that of *ke*, had become, first, that of *ksh*, and, secondly, that of *tsh;* still it was spelt *ce*, the *e*, in the eyes of the Anglo-Saxons, having the power of *y*. In the eyes also of the Anglo-Saxons the compound sound of *ksh*, or *tsh*, would differ from that of *k*, by the addition of *y:* this, it may be said, was the Anglo-Saxon view of the matter. The Anglo-Norman view was different. Modified by the part that, in the combination *th*, was played by the Aspirate *h*, it was conceived by the Anglo-Normans, that *ksh*, or *tsh*, differed from *k*, not by the addition of *y* (expressed by *e*), but by that of *h*. Hence the combination *ch*, as sounded in *chest*. The same was the case with *sh*. This latter

statement is a point in the history, not so much of an Alphabet, as of an Orthography.

The preceding sketch, as has been said more than once before, has been given with one view only, *viz.* that of accounting for defective modes of spelling. The history of almost all Alphabets is the same. Originally either insufficient, erroneous, or inconsistent, they are transplanted from one language to a different, due alterations and additions rarely being made.

§ 122. The reduplication of the Consonant following, to express the shortness (dependence) of the preceding Vowel, is as old as the Classical Languages: *terra*, θαλάσσα. The following extract from the Ormulum (written in the thirteenth century) is the fullest recognition of the practice that I have met with. The extract is from Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica.

And whasc wilenn shall þis boc,
Efft oþerr siþe writenn,
Himm bidde icc þatt hett write rihht,
Swa sum þiss boc himm tæcheþþ;
All þwerrt utt afftcrr þatt itt iss
Uppo þiss firrste bisne,
Wiþþ all swilc rime als her iss sett,
Wiþþ alse fele wordess:
And tatt he loke wel þatt he
*An boc-staff write twiggess,**
Eggwhær þær itt uppo þiss boc
Iss writenn o þatt wise:
Loke he well þatt hett write swa,
Forr he ne magg noht elless,
On Englissh writenn rihht te word,
þatt wite he wel to soþe.

Concerning the various other orthographical expedients, such as the reduplication of the Vowel to express its length (*mood*), &c. &c., I can give no satisfactory detailed history. The influence of the Anglo-Norman, a language

* Write one letter twice.

derived from the Latin, established, in its fullest force, the recognition of the Etymological principle.

§ 123. "I cannot trace the influence of the Mœso-" Gothic Alphabet, except, perhaps, in the case of the " A. S. letters þ and þ, upon any other Alphabet; *nor does* " *it seem to have been itself acted upon by any earlier Gothic* " *Alphabet.*"—The reason for the remark in Italics was as follows. In the Icelandic Language the word *run* signifies a *letter*, and the word *runa* a *furrow*, or *line*. It has also some secondary meanings, which it is unnecessary to give in detail. Upon a vast number of inscriptions, some upon rocks, some upon stones of a defined shape, we find an Alphabet different (at least, apparently so) from that of the Greeks, Latins, and Hebrews, and also unlike that of any modern nation. In this Alphabet there is a marked deficiency of curved or rounded lines, and an exclusive preponderance of straight ones. As it was engraved rather than written, this is what we naturally expect. These letters are called Runes, and the Alphabet which they constitute is called the Runic Alphabet. Sometimes, by an extension of meaning, the Old Norse Language, wherein they most frequently occur, is called the Runic Language. This is as incorrect as to call a Language an Alphabetic Language. To say, however, the Runic stage of a language is neither inaccurate nor inconvenient. The Runic Alphabet, whether borrowed or invented by the early Goths, is of greater antiquity than either the Oldest Teutonic or the Mœso-Gothic Alphabets. The forms, names, and order of the letters may be seen in *Hickes' Thesaurus*, in *Olai Wormii Literatura Runica*, in *Rask's Icelandic Grammar*, and in *W. Grimm's Deutsche Runer.*

The original number of the Runic Letters is sixteen; expressing the sounds of *f*, *u*, þ, *o*, *r*, *k*, *h*, *n*, *a*, *i*, *s*, *t*, *b*, *l*, *m*, *y*. To these are added four Spurious Runes,

denoting *c*, *x*, *æ*, *ö*, and eight Pointed Runes, after the fashion of the Pointed Letters in Hebrew. In all this we see the influence of the imported Alphabet upon the Original Runes, rather than that of the Original Runes upon the imported Alphabet. It should, however, be remarked, that in the Runic Alphabet the sounds of *th* in *thin* is expressed by a simple sign, and that by a sign not unlike the A. S. þ.

Upon the authenticity of the Old Celtic Alphabets, the Ogham and Bobel-Loth, I venture no opinion. That they in no wise influenced the older stages of the current Alphabet may be stated most confidently.

§ 124. *The Order of the Alphabet.*) — In the History of our Alphabet, we have had the history of the changes in the arrangement, as well as of the changes in the number and power of its Letters. The following question now presents itself: viz. Is there, in the order of the letters any *natural* arrangement, or is the original as well as the present succession of letters arbitrary and accidental? In the year 1835 I conceived, that in the order of the Hebrew Alphabet I had discovered a very artificial arrangement. I also imagined that this artificial arrangement had been detected by no one besides myself. Two years afterwards, a friend* stated to me that he had made a similar observation, and in '39 appeared, in Mr. Donaldson's New Cratylus, the quotation with which the present Section will be concluded. The three views in the main coincided; and, as each was formed independently, (Mr. Donaldson's being the first recorded,) they give the satisfactory result of three separate investigations coinciding in a theory essentially the same. The order of the Hebrew Alphabet is as follows: —

* The Reverend W. Harvey, author of *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Vindex Catholicus.*

	Name.	Sound.
1.	*Aleph*	Either a Vowel or a Breathing.
2.	*Beth*	B.
3.	*Gimel*	G, as in *Gun*.
4.	*Daleth*	D.
5.	*He*	Either a Vowel or an Aspirate.
6.	*Vaw*	V.
7.	*Zayn*	Z.
8.	*Kheth*	a variety of K.
9.	*Teth*	a variety of T.
10.	*Yod*	I.
11.	*Caph*	K.
12.	*Lamed*	L.
13.	*Mem*	M.
14.	*Nun*	N.
15.	*Samech*	a variety of S.
16.	*Ayn*	Either a Vowel or —?
17.	*Pe*	P.
18.	*Tsadi*	TS.
19.	*Koph*	a variety of K.
20.	*Resh*	R.
21.	*Sin*	S.
22.	*Tau*	T.

Let *Beth*, *Vaw*, and *Pe* (*b*, *v*, *p*,) constitute a Series called Series P. Let *Gimel*, *Kheth*, and *Koph* (*g*, *kh*, *k'*,) constitute a series called Series K. Let *Daleth*, *Teth*, and *Tau* (*d*, *t'*, *t*,) constitute a series called Series T. Let *Aleph*, *He*, and *Ayn* constitute a series called the Vowel Series. Let the four first letters be taken in their order.

1.	*Aleph*	of the Vowel Series.
2.	*Beth*	of Series P.
3.	*Gimel*	of Series K.
4.	*Daleth*	of Series T.

Herein the Consonant of Series B comes next to the letter of the Vowel Series; that of Series K follows; and, in the last place, comes the letter of Series D. After this the order changes: *Daleth* being followed by *He* of the Vowel Series.

5.	*He*	of the Vowel Series.
6.	*Vaw*	of Series P.
7.	*Zayn*.	———
8.	*Kheth*	of Series K.
9.	*Teth*	of Series T.

In this second sequence the *relative* positions of *V*, *Kh*, and *T'* are the same in respect to each other, and the same in respect to the Vowel Series. The sequence itself

is broken by the letter *Zayn*, but it is remarkable that the principle of the sequence is the same. Series P follows the Vowel, and Series T is farthest from it. After this the System becomes but fragmentary. Still, even now, *Pe*, of Series P, follows *Ayn*; *Tau*, of Series D, is farthest from it; and *Koph*, of Series K, is intermediate. I am satisfied that we have in the Hebrew Alphabet, and in all Alphabets derived from it, (consequently in the English,) if not a System, the rudiments of a System; and that the System is of the sort indicated above; in other words, that the Order of the Alphabet is a *Circulating Order*.

In Mr. Donaldson's hands this view is not only a fact but an instrument of criticism: — "The fact is, in our "opinion, the original Semitic Alphabet contained only six- "teen letters. This appears from the organic arrangement "of their characters. The remaining sixteen letters appear "in the following order: —*Aleph*, *Beth*, *Gimel*, *Daleth*, *He*, "*Vau*, *Kheth*, *Teth*, *Lamed*, *Mem*, *Nun*, *Samech*, *Ayn*, *Pi*, "*Koph*, *Tau*. If we examine this order more minutely, "we shall see that it is not arbitrary or accidental, but "strictly organic, according to the Semitic Articulation. "We have four classes, each consisting of four letters: the "first and second classes consist each of three mutes, pre- "ceded by a breathing; the third of the three liquids and "the sibilant, which, perhaps, closed the oldest Alphabet "of all; and the fourth contains the three supernumerary "mutes, preceded by a breathing. We place the charac- "ters first vertically:—

Aleph . .	א	. . First breathing.
Beth . .	ב	. . B)
Gimel . .	ג	. . G } *Media.*
Daleth . .	ד	. . D)
He . .	ה	. . Second breathing.

Vaw	ו	Bh	*Aspirate.*
Cheth	ח	Gh	*Aspirate.*
Teth	ט	Dh	*Aspirate.*
Lamed	ל	L	*Liquids.*
Mem	מ	M	*Liquids.*
Nun	נ	N	*Liquids.*
Samech	ס	S	*The Sibilant.*
Ain	ע	Third Breathing.	
Pe	פ	P	*Tenues.*
Koph	ק	K	*Tenues.*
Tau	ת	T	*Tenues.*

" In the horizontal arrangement we shall, for the sake " of greater simplicity, omit the Liquids and the Sibilant, " and then we have :

Breathings.	*Labials.*	*Palatals.*	*Linguals.*
א	ב	ג	ד
ה	ו	ח	ט
ע	פ	ק	ת

" In this we see, that, while the horizontal lines give us " the arrangement of the mutes according to the breath- " ings, the vertical columns exhibit them arranged accord- " ing to the organ by which they are produced. Such a " classification is obviously artificial."

§ 125. *Parallel and Equivalent Orthographies.*)—Let there be in two given languages the sound of *k*, as in *kin*. Let each of these languages represent it by the same letter, *k*. In this case, the two Orthographies are identical. Let, however, one nation represent it by *k*, and another by *c*. In this case, the Orthographies are not identical, but Parallel. The same is the case with combinations. Let one nation (say the Anglo-Saxon) represent the sound of *y* (in *ye*) by *e*, whilst another nation (the Norse) represents it by *j*. What the Anglo-Saxon spells *ceaster*, the Northman spells *kjaster;* and what the Northman spells *kjære*, the Anglo-Saxon spells *cære*. Let the sound of this *ce* and *kj* undergo

a change, and become *ksh ; kjære*, and *ceære*, being pronounced *kshære*. The view of the Northman and Anglo-Saxon will be the same; each will consider that the compound sound differs from the simple one by the addition of the sound of *y ;* that sound being expressed in one nation by *e*, and in the other by *j*. In this case the two expressions of the compound sound are Parallel, its elements being considered the same, although the signs by which those elements are expressed are different.

Let, however, a different view of the compound sound be taken. Let it be thought that the sound of *ksh* differs from that of *k*, not by the addition of the sound of *y*, but by that of *h ;* and so let it be spelt *kh* or *ch*. In this case the Orthographies *kh* and *kj* (or *ce*) are not Parallel, but Equivalent. They express the same sound, but they do not denote the same elements. The same sound is, very possibly, expressed by the Anglo-Saxon *ce*, the Norwegian *kj*, and the English *ch*. In this case *ce* and *kj* are Parallel, *ce* and *ch* Equivalent, Orthographies. For the application of this distinction see Appendix B.

PART III.

ETYMOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE PROVINCE OF ETYMOLOGY.

§ 126.) THE word Etymology, derived from the Greek, in the current language of Scholars and Grammarians, has a double meaning. At times it is used in a wide, and at times in a restricted sense. The elucidation of these meanings is (amongst other points) the subject-matter of the present Chapter. What follows is an exhibition of the province or department of Etymology.

If in the English language we take such a word as *fathers*, we are enabled to divide it into two parts; in other words, to reduce it into two elements. By comparing it with the word *father*, we see that the *s* is neither part nor parcel of the original word. The word *fathers* is a word capable of being analysed; *father* being the original primitive word, and *s* the secondary, superadded termination. From the word *father*, the word *fathers* is derived, or (changing the expression) deduced, or descended. What has been said of the word *fathers* may also be said of *fatherly*, *fatherlike*, *fatherless*, &c. &c. Now, from the word *father*, all these words (*fathers*, *fatherly*, *fatherlike*, and *fatherless*) differ in form, and (not, however, necessa-

rily) in meaning. To become such a word as *fathers*, &c., the word *father* is changed. Of changes of this sort it is the province of Etymology to take cognizance.

Compared with the form *fathers*, the word *father* is the older form of the two. The word *father* is a word current in this the nineteenth century. The same word was current in the first century, although under a different form, and in a different language. Then, in the Latin language, the form was *pater*; and, earlier still, there is the Sanskrit form *pitr*. Now, just as the word *father*, compared with *fathers*, is original and primitive, so is *pater*, compared with *father*, original and primitive. The difference is, that in respect to *father* and *fathers*, the change that takes place takes place within the same language, whilst the change that takes place between *pater* and *father* takes place within different languages. Of changes of this latter kind it is the province of Etymology to take cognizance.

In its widest signification, Etymology takes cognizance *of the changes of the form of words*. However, as the Etymology that compares the forms *fathers* and *father* is different from the Etymology that compares *father* and *pater*, we have, of Etymology, two sorts: one dealing with the changes of form that words undergo in one and the same language (*father*, *fathers*), the other dealing with the changes that words undergo in passing from one language to another (*pater*, *father*).

The first of these sorts may be called Etymology in the limited sense of the word, or the Etymology of the Grammarian. In this case it is opposed to Orthoepy, Orthography, Syntax, and the other parts of Grammar. This is the Etymology of the ensuing pages.

The second may be called Etymology in the wide sense of the word, Historical Etymology, or Comparative Etymology.

It must be again repeated that the two sorts of Etymology agree in one point; *viz.* in taking cognizance of the *changes of form that words undergo.* Whether the change arise from grammatical reasons, as *father, fathers,* or from a change of language taking place in the lapse of time, as *pater, father,* is a matter of indifference.

In the Latin *pater,* and in the English *father,* we have one of two things, either two words descended or derived from each other, or two words descended or derived from a common original source.

In *fathers* we have a formation deduced from the radical word *father.*

In *fatherlike* we have a compound word, capable of being analysed into the two primitive words, 1, *father;* 2, *like.*

With these preliminaries, we may appreciate (or criticise) Dr. Johnson's explanation of the word Etymology.

ETYMOLOGY, *n. s.* (*Etymologia,* Lat.) ἔτυμος (*etymos*) *true,* and λόγος (*logos*) *a word.*

1. *The descent or derivation of a word from its original; the deduction of formations from the radical word; the analysis of compounds into primitives.*

2. *The part of Grammar which delivers the inflections of Nouns and Verbs.*

§ 127. *Grimm's Law.*)—Although the more especial object of Part III. is Etymology in the limited sense of the word, in Part I. the chief subject is Comparative, or Historical Etymology. In Comparative, or Historical Etymology, one of the most fruitful discoveries made by modern scholars is an important fact relating to the change of Consonants, which, from having been first exhibited by James Grimm, in his German Grammar (vol. i. p. 584), is currently called *Grimm's Law.* The present is a proper place for its exhibition.

The attention of the reader is directed to the initial Consonant in the following list of words.

Sanskrit.	*Latin.*	*Greek.*	*Mœso-Gothic.*
Padas	*Pes*	πούς	*Fotus.*
	Piscis		*Fisks.*
	Pater		*Fadrs.*
		πολύ	*Filu.*
		πλεος	*Fulls.*
	Primus		*Frumist.*

From this, we see, that where the Consonant is, in Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek, *p*, it is, in the Mœso-Gothic, *f*. This gives us the general fact, that the difference of form between a Sanskrit, a Classical, and a Mœso-Gothic word is regular and uniform; in other words, subject to a Rule or Law.

Now, the same regularity takes place with the letter *t* and its allied sounds. The *t* of the Classical and Sanskrit languages becomes, in Mœso-Gothic, *th* (or þ); and, as þ is to *t* as *f* is to *p* (see § 66), *viz.* the so-called Aspirate of a Lene, and as *p*, *t*, *f*, and þ are all sharp, we are enabled to use general language, and to say (at least as far as Series *p* and *t* are concerned) that the sharp *Lenes* of the Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek become, in Mœso-Gothic, the corresponding sharp *Aspirates*. With *k* this is not the case; the so-called Aspirate of *k* (a rare sound everywhere) is not found in the Mœso-Gothic. Neither is it so with *s;* the Sibilants following other rules.

Sanskrit.	*Latin.*	*Greek.*	*Mœso-Gothic.*
	Tu		þu.
	Tendere	τείνειν	þanjan.
	Tres	τρεῖς	þreis.
	Tacere		þahan.
		τρέχειν	þragjan.
		ταλᾶν	þulan.
	Tectum		þak.
Tad		το	þat.

Such are the changes of the *sharp* Lenes. The Flat Lenes, *b*, *d*, *g* (as in *gun*), follow another rule; they follow it, however, with equal regularity and uniformity. *B*, Classical and Sanskrit, becomes, in the Gothic languages, *p*; *i. e.* the flat Lene is changed, not to its flat Aspirate *v*, (after the analogy of *p* and *f*, *t* and þ,) but to its corresponding *sharp Lene*. In like manner, *d* (the flat Lene) becomes, not ð, but *t*; whilst *g* is changed into *k*. Here, however, our examples must be taken from the Gothic languages *en masse*, and not from the Mœso-Gothic alone. Gr. κάνναβις; Lat. *cannabis*; Norse, *hanpr*; Eng. *hemp*.—Lat. *stabulum*; Norse, *stöpul*. — Sansk. *dantas*; Gr. ὀδούς, ὄδοντος; Lat. *dens*, *dentis*; M. G. *tunþus*.—Gr. δαμᾶν; Lat. *domare*; M. G. *tamjan*, *to tame*. — Gr. γένος; Lat. *genus*; Norse, *kuni*, *a race*.—Gr. γένυς; Lat. *gena*; Norse, *kinn*, *a cheek*, *jaw*, *chin*.—Gr. γόνυ; Lat. *genu*; Norse, *knê*, &c. &c.

Such are the changes of the *flat* Lenes, *viz.* to their corresponding sharp ones. In respect to the so-called Aspirates, three preliminary observations are necessary:

I. That the so-called Aspirates of *k* and *g*, rare in all languages, are (with, perhaps, a few exceptions) wanting both in the Classical and Gothic languages; and that where they occur, they generally partake of the changes either of the Semivowel *y*, or of *h*.

II. That although the so-called Aspirates of *k* and *g* are wanting, the first of them is replaced, both in the Gothic and the Classical languages, by the allied sound of the Greek χ, and the German *ch* (as in *auch*), which may, by an Etymological fiction, be dealt with as the true (so-called) Aspirate of *k*.

III. That the Flat Aspirates *v* and ð in Greek, had no sign to express them; so that, in speaking of the changes undergone by the Aspirates, we speak more especially of

the sharp ones, *f*, *th*, (or þ) and *ch*, the conventional representative of the so-called Aspirate of *h*. Now these follow a regular Rule. They all, in Mœso-Gothic, change to the Flat Lene of their respective Series; *viz.*

F to *b*.—Lat. *frangere, fregi;* M. G. *brikan, to break.*—Lat. *frui, fructus;* M. G. *brûkôn, to use, to enjoy.*—Lat. *frater;* M. G. *brôþar, brother.*—Lat. *fero;* Gr. φέρω; M. G. *baira, I bear,* &c. &c.

Th to *d*.—Gr. θυγάτηρ; M. G. *daúhtar.*—Gr. θύρα; M. G. *daúr.*—Gr. θαρρεῖν; M. G. *ga-daúran, dare.* N. B. The sound of *th* is wanting in Latin.

Ch to *g*.—Like *th*, the sound of the Greek χ is wanting in Latin, where it is generally represented by *h;* as χειμὼν, *hiems.*—Gr. χὴν; Lat. *anser;* M. G. *gans.*—Gr. χόρτος; Lat. *hortus;* M. G. *gards,* &c. &c. &c.

Such are the main points in Grimm's statement concerning the regularity and the nature of the changes of the Mutes, in their transition from one language to another. The fact of these changes being regular, when once indicated, may be applied to any number of languages; and Grimm, himself, extending it from the M. G. to the Old High German, observed that in that language the *f* of the Mœso-Gothic became *v;* the *p* became *f;* the *b* became *p;* the *th* became *d;* the *t* became *z* (= *ts*), *th* being not a sound of the language; the *d* became *t;* the *k* became *ch;* the *g* became *k*. This view of the subject he represented in the following tabular arrangement.

Greek	P.	B.	F.	T.	D.	Th.	K.	G.	Ch.
M. G.	F.	P.	B.	Th.	T.	D.	—	K.	G.
O.H.G.	V.	F.	P.	D.	Z.	T.	G.	Ch.	K.

OR,

Gr.	*M.G.*	*O.H.G.*	*Gr.*	*M.G.*	*O.H.G.*	*Gr.*	*M.G.*	*O.H.G.*
P.	F.	V.	T.	Th.	D.	K.	—	G.
B.	P.	F.	D.	T.	Z.	G.	K.	Ch.
F.	B.	P.	Th.	D.	T.	Ch.	G.	K.

The present section has been written rather for the sake of indicating the regularity of certain changes, which to the generality seem capricious, than for the sake of exhausting the subject.

CHAPTER II.

ON GENDER.

§ 128. THE nature of Gender is best exhibited by reference to those languages wherein the distinction of Gender is most conspicuous. Such a language, amongst others, is the Latin.

How far is there such a thing as Gender in the English language? This depends upon the meaning that we attach to the word Gender.

In the Latin language, where there are confessedly Genders, we have the words *taurus*, meaning *a bull*, and *vacca*, meaning *a cow*. Here the natural distinction of sex is expressed by *wholly* different words. With this we have corresponding modes of expression in English: *e.g.*

Male.	*Female.*	*Male.*	*Female.*
Bachelor	Maid.	Horse	Mare.
Boar	Sow.	Ram	Ewe.
Boy	Girl.	Son	Daughter.
Brother	Sister.	Uncle	Aunt.
Buck	Doe.	Father	Mother, &c.&c.

The mode, however, of expressing different sexes by *wholly* different words is not a matter of Gender. The words *boy* and *girl* bear no *etymological* relation to each other; neither being derived from the other, nor in any way connected with it.

§ 129. Neither are words like *cock-sparrow*, *man-servant*, *he-goat*, &c. &c. as compared with *hen-sparrow*, *maid-*

servant, she-goat, &c. &c. specimens of Gender. Here a difference of sex is indicated by the addition of a fresh term, from which is formed a compound word.

§ 130. In the Latin words *genitrix, a mother,* and *genitor, a father,* we have a nearer approach to Gender. Here the difference of sex is expressed by a difference of termination; the words *genitor* and *genitrix* being in a true etymological relation: *i. e.* either derived from each other, or from some common source. With this we have, in English, corresponding modes of expression: *e. g.*

Male.	*Female.*	*Male.*	*Female.*
Actor	Actress.	Lion	Lioness.
Arbiter	Arbitress.	Peer	Peeress.
Baron	Baroness.	Poet	Poetess.
Benefactor	Benefactress.	Sorcerer	Sorceress.
Count	Countess.	Songster	Songstress.
Duke	Duchess.	Tiger	Tigress.

This, however, in strict grammatical language, is an approach to Gender, rather than Gender itself. Its difference from true grammatical Gender is as follows.

Let the Latin words *genitor* and *genitrix* be declined:—

Sing.	*Nom.*	Genitor	Genitrix.
	Gen.	Genitor-*is*	Genitric-*is.*
	Dat.	Genitor-*i*	Genitric-*i.*
	Acc.	Genitor-*em*	Genitric-*em.*
	Voc.	Genitor	Genitrix.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Genitor-*es*	Genitric-*es.*
	Gen.	Genitor-*um*	Genitric-*um.*
	Dat.	Genitor-*ibus*	Genitric-*ibus.*
	Acc.	Genitor-*es*	Genitric-*es.*
	Voc.	Genitor-*es*	Genitric-*es.*

The syllables in italics are the signs of the Cases and Numbers. Now these signs are the same in each word, the difference of meaning (or sex) not affecting them.

§ 131. Contrast, however, with the words *genitor* and

genitrix the words *domina*, *a mistress*, and *dominus*, *a master*.

Sing.	*Nom.*	Domin-*a*.	Domin-*us*.
	Gen.	Domin-*æ*.	Domin-*i*.
	Dat.	Domin-*æ*.	Domin-*o*.
	Acc.	Domin-*am*.	Domin-*um*.
	Voc.	Domin-*a*.	Domin-*e*.
Plur.	*Nom.*	Domin-*æ*.	Domin-*i*.
	Gen.	Domin-*arum*.	Domin-*orum*.
	Dat.	Domin-*abus*.	Domin-*is*.
	Acc.	Domin-*as*.	Domin-*os*.
	Voc.	Domin-*æ*.	Domin-*i*.

Here the letters in italics, or the signs of the Cases and Numbers, are different, the difference being brought about by the difference of Gender. Now it is very evident that, if *genitrix* be a specimen of Gender, *domina* is something more.

As terms, to be useful, must be limited, it may be laid down, as a sort of definition, that *there is no Gender where there is no Affection of the Declension:* consequently that, although we have, in English, words corresponding to *genitrix* and *genitor*, we have no true Genders until we find words corresponding to *dominus* and *domina*.

§ 132. The second element in the notion of Gender, although I will not venture to call it an essential one, is the following: — In the words *domina* and *dominus*, *mistress* and *master*, there is a *natural* distinction of sex; the one being masculine, or male, the other feminine, or female. In the words *sword* and *lance* there is *no natural* distinction of sex. Notwithstanding this, the word *hasta*, in Latin, is as much a Feminine Gender as *domina*, whilst *gladius*, *a sword*, is, like *dominus*, a Masculine Noun. From this we see that, in languages wherein there are true Genders, a fictitious or conventional sex is attributed even to inanimate objects. Sex is a natural distinction, Gender a grammatical one.

§ 133. "Although we have, in English, words corre-
"sponding to *genitrix* and *genitor*, we have no true Genders
"until we find *words corresponding to dominus and domina.*"
The sentence, quoted from § 131, was intentionally worded with caution. Words like *dominus* and *domina*, that is, words where the declension is affected by the sex, *are* to be found.

The pronoun *him*, from the Anglo-Saxon and English *he*, as compared with the pronoun *her*, from the Anglo-Saxon *heò*, is affected in its declension by the difference of sex, and is a true, though fragmentary specimen of Gender: for, be it observed, that as both words are in the same Case and Number, the difference in form must be referred to a difference of sex expressed by Gender. The same is the case with the form *his*, as compared with *her*.

The Pronoun *it*, (originally *hit*,) as compared with *he*, is a specimen of Gender.

The Relative *what*, as compared with the Masculine *who*, is a specimen of Gender.

The forms *it* (for *hit*) and *he* are as much Genders as *hic* and *hæc*, and the forms *hic* and *hæc* are as much Genders as *dominus* and *domina*.

The forms *it* and *what* (to which may be added *that*,) are not only true Genders, but Genders of a peculiar kind. In § 4, it was stated that the Norse differed from the Teutonic in possessing a Neuter form in *t*. Of this Norse Neuter in a Teutonic language the words *it*, *what*, *that*, are fragmentary specimens.

Which, as seen in Chapter VI, is *not* the Neuter of *who*.

§ 134. Just as there are in English fragments of a Gender modifying the declension, so are there, also, fragments of the second element of Gender; viz. the attribution of Sex to objects naturally destitute of it. *The Sun in* his *glory; the Moon in* her *wane*, are examples of this.

A sailor calls his ship *she*. A husbandman, according to Mr. Cobbett, does the same with his *plough* and working implements: —"In speaking of a *ship* we say *she* and *her*. "And you know that our country-folks in Hampshire call "almost everything *he* or *she*. It is curious to observe, "that country labourers give the Feminine appellation to "those things only which are more closely identified with "themselves, and by the qualities or conditions of which "their own efforts, and their character as workmen, are "affected. The mower calls his *scythe* a *she*, the plough-"man calls his *plough* a *she*; but a prong or a shovel, or a "harrow, which passes promiscuously from hand to hand, "and which is appropriated to no particular labourer, is "called a *he*."—*English Grammar*, Letter V.

Now although Mr. Cobbett's statements may account for a sailor calling his ship *she*, they will not account for the custom of giving to the sun a Masculine, and to the moon a Feminine Pronoun, as is done in the expressions quoted at the head of this section; still less will it account for the circumstance of the Germans reversing the Gender, and making the *sun* Feminine, and the *moon* Masculine.

Let there be a period in the history of a nation wherein the sun and moon are dealt with, not as inanimate masses of matter, but as animated divinities. Let there, in other words, be a period in the history of a nation wherein dead things are personified, and wherein there is a mythology. Let an object like the *sun* be deemed a male, and an object like the *moon* a female deity.

The Germans say the *sun in* her *glory;* the *moon in* his *wane*. This difference between the usage of the two languages, like so many others, is explained by the influence of the Classical Languages upon the English.— "*Mundilfori had two children; a son, Mâni* (*Moon*), *and* "*a daughter, Sôl* (*Sun*)." — Such is an extract (taken

second-hand from Grimm, vol. iii. p. 349) out of an Icelandic mythological work, *viz.* the Prose Edda. In the Classical Languages, however, *Phœbus* and *Sol* are Masculine, and *Luna* and *Diana* Feminine. Hence it is that, although in Anglo-Saxon and Old-Saxon the *sun* is *Feminine*, it is in English, Masculine.

Philosophy, *charity*, &c. &c., or the names of abstract qualities personified, take a conventional sex, and are Feminine from their being Feminine in Latin.

As in these words there is no change of form, the consideration of them is a point of Rhetorick, rather than of Etymology.

Upon phrases like *Cock Robin*, *Robin Redbreast*, *Jenny Wren*, expressive of sex, much information may be collected from Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, vol. iii. p. 359.

§ 135. The remainder of this Chapter is devoted to miscellaneous remarks upon the true and apparent Genders of the English Language.

1. With the false Genders, like *baron*, *baroness*, it is as a general rule that the Feminine form is derived from the Masculine, and not the Masculine from the Feminine; as *peer*, *peeress*. The words *widower*, *gander*, and *drake*, (for this see below) are exceptions. For the word *wizard*, from *witch*, see the Section on Augmentative forms.

2. The termination *-ess*, in which so large a portion of our Feminine Substantives terminate, is not of Saxon but of Classical origin, being derived from the termination *ix*, *Genitrix*.

3. The words *shepherdess*, *huntress*, and *hostess*, are faulty; the radical part of the word being Germanic, and the secondary part Classical.

4. The termination *-inn*, so current in German, as the equivalent to *-ess*, and as a Feminine affix (*Freund*, *a friend*; *Freundinn*, *a female friend*), is found only in one or two words in English.

There were five *carlins* in the South
That fell upon a scheme,
To send a lad to London town
To bring them tidings hame.

BURNS.

Carlin means an *old woman;* Icelandic, *kerling*, Sw. *käring*, Dan. *kælling*. Root, *carl*.

Vixen is a true Feminine derivative from *fox*. German, *füchsinn*.

Bruin = *the bear*, may be either a female form, as in O. H. G. *përo*, a *he-bear*, *pirinn*, a *she-bear*, or it may be the Norse form, *björn*, a *bear*, male or female.

Words like *margravine* and *landgravine* prove nothing, being scarcely naturalized.

5. The termination *-str*, as in *Webster*, *songster*, and *Baxter*, was originally a Feminine affix. Thus, in A. S.

Sangere, *a male singer.*	were opposed to	Sangëstre, *a female singer.*
Bäcere, *a male baker.*		Bacestre, *a female baker.*
Fiðelere, *a male fiddler.*		Fiðelstre, *a female fiddler.*
Vebbere, *a male weaver.*		Vëbbëstre, *a female weaver.*
Rædere, *a male reader.*		Rædestre, *a female reader.*
Seamere, *a male seamer.*		Seamestre, *a female seamer.*

The same is the case in the present Dutch of Holland, *e. g. spookster*, a *female fortune-teller; bakster*, a *baking-woman; waschster*, a *washerwoman* (*Grimm*, D. G. iii. p. 339). The word *spinster* still retains its original Feminine force. Hence

6. The words *songstress* and *seamstress*, besides being, as far as concerns the intermixture of languages, in the predicament of *shepherdess*, have, moreover, a double Feminine termination; 1st. *-str*, of Germanic, 2nd. *-ess*, of Classical origin.

7. In the word *heroine* we have a Greek termination, just as *ix* is a Latin, and *inn* a German one. It must not

however, be considered as derived from *hero*, by any process of the English language, but be dealt with as a separate importation from the Greek language.

8. The form *deaconess* is not wholly unexceptionable; since the termination *-ess* is of Latin, the root *deacon* of Greek origin: this Greek origin being rendered all the more conspicuous by the spelling, *deacon* (from *diaconos*), as compared with the Latin *decanus*.

9. In *dutchess* and *marchioness* we see the influence of a small Vowel upon *k*. See § 78.

10. The circumstance of *prince* ending in the sound of *s*, works a change in the accent of the word. As *s* is the final letter, it is necessary, in forming the Plural Number, and the Genitive Case, to add, not the simple letter *s*, as in *peers*, *priests*, &c. &c., but the syllable *-es*. This makes the Plural Number and Genitive Case the same as the Feminine form. Hence the Feminine form is accented *princéss*, while *péeress*, *príestess*, &c. &c., carry the accent on the first syllable. *Princéss* is remarkable as being the only word in English where the accent lies on the subordinate syllable. See § 95.

11. It is uncertain whether *kit*, as compared with *cat*, be a Feminine form or a Diminutive form; in other words, whether it mean a *female cat* or a *young cat*.—See the Chapter on the Diminutives.

12. *Goose*, *Gander*. — One peculiarity in this pair of words has already been indicated. In the older forms of the word *goose*, such as χήν, Gr.; *anser*, Lat.; *gans*, German, as well as in the derived form *gander*, we have the proofs that, originally, there belonged to the word the sound of the letter *n*. In the forms ὀδούς, ὄδοντος, Greek; *dens*, *dentis*, Latin; *zahn*, Germ.; *tooth*, English, we find the analogy that accounts for the ejection of the *n*, and the lengthening of the Vowel preceding. With respect,

however, to the *d* in *gander*, it is not easy to say whether it is inserted in one word or omitted in the other. Neither can we give the precise power of the *er*. The following forms (taken from *Grimm*, iii. p. 341,) occur in the different Gothic dialects. *Gans*, Fem.; *ganazzo*, Masc., O. H. G.—*Gôs*, F.; *gandra*, M., A. S.—*Gâs*, Icelandic, F.; *gaas*, Dan. F.; *gassi*, Icel. M.; *gasse*, Dan. M. *Ganser*, *ganserer*, *gansart*, *gänserich*, *gander*, Masculine forms in different New-German dialects.

13. Observe, the form *gänserich* has a Masculine termination. The word *täuberich*, in provincial New-German, has the same form and the same power. It denotes a *male dove; taube*, in German, signifying a *dove*. In *gänserich* and *täuberich*, we find preserved the termination *rich* (or *rik*), with a Masculine power. Of this termination we have a remnant, in English, preserved in the curious word *drake*. To *duck* the word *drake* has no etymological relation whatsoever. It is derived from a word with which it has but one letter in common; *viz.* the Latin *anas*, *a duck*. Of this the root is *anat-*, as seen in the Genitive Case *anatis*. In O. H. G. we find the form *anetrëkho*, *a drake;* in Provincial New High-German there is *enterich* and *äntrecht*, from whence come the English and Low-German form *drake*. (*Grimm*, D. G. iii. p. 341.)

14. *Peacock*, *peahen*, *bridegroom*.—In these compounds, it is not the words *pea* and *bride*, that are rendered Masculine or Feminine by the addition of *cock*, *hen*, and *groom*, but it is the words *cock*, *hen*, and *groom* that are modified by prefixing *pea* and *bride*. For an appreciation of this distinction, see the Chapter on Composition.

CHAPTER III.

THE NUMBERS.

§ 136. In the Greek language the word *patær* signifies a *father*, speaking of *one*, whilst *patere* signifies *two fathers*, speaking of a pair, and, thirdly, *pateres* signifies *fathers*, speaking of any number beyond two. The three words, *patær*, *patere*, and *pateres*, are said to be in different Numbers, the difference of meaning being expressed by a difference of form. These Numbers have names. The Number that speaks of *one* is the *Singular*, the Number that speaks of *two*, is the *Dual* (from the Latin word *duo*=*two*), and the Number that speaks of *more than two*, is the *Plural*.

All languages have Numbers, but all languages have not them to the same extent. The Hebrew has a Dual, but it is restricted to Nouns only (in Greek being extended to Verbs). It has, moreover, this peculiarity; it applies, for the most part, only to things which are naturally double, as *the two eyes*, *the two hands*, &c. &c. The Latin has no Dual Number at all.

§ 137. The question presents itself, — to what extent have we Numbers in English? Like the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin, we have a Singular and a Plural. Like the Latin, and unlike the Greek and Hebrew, we have no Dual.

§ 138. Different from the question, to what degree have

we Numbers? is the question,—over what extent of our language have we Numbers? This distinction has already been foreshadowed or indicated. The Greeks, who said *typtô, I beat; typteton, ye two beat; typtomen, we beat*, had a Dual Number for their Verbs as well as their Nouns; while the Hebrew Dual was limited to the Nouns only. In the Greek, then, the Dual Number is spread over a greater extent of the language than in the Hebrew.

There is no Dual in the present English. It has been seen, however (*p.* 59), that in the Anglo-Saxon there *was* a Dual. But the Anglo-Saxon Dual, being restricted to the Personal Pronouns (*wit, we two; git, ye two*), was not co-extensive with the Greek Dual.

There is no Dual in the present German. In the Ancient German there was one.

In the present Danish and Swedish there is no Dual. In the Old Norse and in the present Icelandic a Dual Number is to be found.

From this we learn that the Dual Number is one of those Inflections that languages drop as they become Modern.

The Numbers, then, in the present English are two, the Singular and the Plural. Over what extent of language have we a Plural? The Latins say, *bonus pater, a good father; boni patres, good fathers.* In the Latin, the Adjective *bonus* changes its form with the change of Number of the Substantive that it accompanies. In English it is only the Substantive that is changed. Hence we see that in the Latin language the Numbers were extended to Adjectives, whereas in English they are confined to the Substantives and Pronouns. Compared with the Anglo-Saxon, the present English is in the same relation as it is with the Latin. In the A. S. there were Plural forms for the Adjectives. (See § 4.)

For the forms *selves* and *others*, see Chap. VI. For the present, it is sufficient to foreshadow a remark which will be made on the word *self*, *viz.* that whether it be a Pronoun, a Substantive, or an Adjective, is a disputed point.

Words like *wheat*, *pitch*, *gold*, &c. &c. where the idea is naturally Singular; words like *bellows*, *scissars*, *lungs*, &c. where the idea is naturally Plural; and words like *deer*, *sheep*, where the same form serves for the Singular and Plural, inasmuch as there takes place no change of form, are not under the province of Etymology.

§ 139. The current rule is, that the Plural Number is formed from the Singular by adding *s*, as *father*, *fathers*. However, if the reader will revert to the Section upon the Sharp and Flat Mutes, and to *p.* 168, where it is stated that Mutes of different degrees of Sharpness and Flatness cannot come together in the same Syllable, he will find occasion to take to the current rule a verbal exception. The letter added to the word *father*, making it *fathers*, is *s* to the eye only. To the ear it is *z*. The word sounds *fatherz*. If the *s* retained its sound, the spelling would be *fatherce*. In *stags*, *lads*, &c. the sound is *stagz*, *ladz*. The rule, then, for the formation of the English Plurals, rigorously expressed, is as follows.—*The Plural is formed from the Singular, by adding to words ending in a Vowel, a Liquid or Flat Mute, the Flat Lene Sibilant* (*z*); *and to words ending in a Sharp Mute, the Sharp Lene Sibilant* (*s*): *e. g.* (the *sound* of the word being expressed,) *pea*, *peaz*; *tree*, *treez*; *day*, *dayz*; *hill*, *hillz*; *hen*, *henz*; *gig*, *gigz*; *trap*, *traps*; *pit*, *pits*; *stack*, *stacks*. The reasons for this sound of *z* being spelt with an *s* may be collected from *p.* 168. Upon the formation of the English Plural some further remarks are necessary.

I. In the case of words ending in *b*, *v*, *d*, the *th* in *thine*=ð, or *g*, a change either of the final Flat Consonant,

or of the Sharp *s* affixed, was not a matter of choice, but of necessity; the combinations *abs*, *avs*, *ads*, *aðs*, *ags*, being unpronounceable. See the Section on the Law of Accommodation.

II. Whether the first of the two Mutes should be accommodated to the second (*aps*, *afs*, *ats*, *aþs*, *asks*), or the second to the first (*abz*, *avz*, *aðz*, *agz*), is determined by the habit of the particular language in question; and, with a few apparent exceptions (mark the word *apparent*), it is the rule of the English language to accommodate the second sound to the first, and not *vice versâ*.

III. Such combinations as *peas*, *trees*, *hills*, *hens*, &c. (the *s* preserving its original power, and being sounded as if written *peace*, *treece*, *hillce*, *hence*,) being pronounceable, the change from *s* to *z*, in words so ending, is *not* a matter determined by the necessity of the case, but by the habit of the English language.

IV. Although the vast majority of our Plurals end, not in *s*, but in *z*, the original addition was not *z*, but *s*. This we infer from three facts: 1. From the spelling; 2. From the fact of the sound of *z* being either rare or non-existent in A. S.; 3. From the sufficiency of the causes to bring about the change.

It may now be seen that some slight variations in the form of our Plurals are either mere points of Orthography, or else capable of being explained on very simple Euphonic Principles.

Boxes, *churches*, *judges*, *lashes*, *kisses*, *blazes*, *princes*.— Here there is the addition, not of the mere letter *s*, but of the syllable *es*. As *s* cannot be immediately added to *s*, the intervention of a Vowel becomes necessary; and that all the words whose Plural is formed in *-es*, really end either in the sounds of *s*, or in the allied sounds of *z*, *sh*, or *zh*, may be seen by analysis; since *x*=*ks*, *ch*=*tsh*, and

j, or *ge* = *dzh*, whilst *ce*, in *prince*, is a mere point of Orthography for *s*.

Monarchs, heresiarchs.—Here the *ch* equals not *tsh*, but *k*, so that there is no need of being told that they do not follow the analogy of *church*, &c. &c.

Cargoes, echoes.—From *cargo* and *echo*, with the addition of *e*; an orthographical expedient for the sake of denoting the length of the Vowel *o*.

Beauty, beauties; key, keys.—Like the words *cargoes*, &c. &c. these forms are points, not of Etymology, but of Orthography.

"A few *apparent* exceptions."—These words are taken from Observation II. in the present Section. The apparent exceptions to the rule there laid down are the words *loaf, wife*, and a few others, whose Plural is not sounded *loafs, wifs* (*loafce, wifce*), but *loavz, wivz* (written *loaves, wives*). Here it seems as if *z* had been added to the Singular; and, contrary to rule, the final letter of the original word been accommodated to the *z*, instead of the *z* being accommodated to the final syllable of the word, and so becoming *s*. It is, however, very probable that instead of the Plural form being changed, it is the Singular that has been modified. In the A. S. the *f* at the end of words (as in the present Swedish) had the power of *v*. In the allied language the words in point are spelt with the *Flat* Mute, as *weib, laub, kalb, halb, stab*, German. The same is the case with *leaf, leaves; calf, calves; half, halves; staff, staves; beef, beeves:* this last word being Anglo-Norman.

Pence).—The peculiarity of this word consists in having a *Flat* Liquid, followed by the Sharp Sibilant *s*, (spelt *ce*,) contrary to the rule given above. In the first place, it is a contracted form from *pennies;* in the second place, its sense is Collective rather than Plural; in the third place,

the use of the sharp Sibilant Lene distinguishes it from *pens*, sounded *penz*. That its sense is Collective rather than Plural (a distinction to which the reader's attention is directed), we learn from the word *sixpence*, which, compared with *sixpences*, is no Plural, but a Singular form.

Dice.)—In respect to its form, peculiar for the reason that *pence* is peculiar. We find the sound of *s* after a Vowel, where that of *z* is expected. This distinguishes *dice* for play, from *dies* (*diez*) for coining. *Dice*, perhaps, like *pence* is Collective rather than Plural.

In *geese*, *lice*, and *mice*, we have, apparently, the same phenomenon as in *dice*, *viz.* a sharp Sibilant (*s*) where a *flat* one (*z*) is expected. The *s*, however, in these words is not the sign of the Plural, but the last letter of the original word.

Alms.)—This is no true Plural form. The *s* belongs to the original word, A. S. *ælmesse*, G. ἐλεημοσύνη, just as the *s* in *goose* does. How far the word, although a true Singular in its form, may have a Collective signification, and require its Verb to be Plural, is a point not of Etymology, but of Syntax. The same is the case with the word *riches*, from the French *richesse*. In *riches* the last syllable being sounded as *ez*, increases its liability to pass for a Plural.

News, *means*, *pains.*—These, the reverse of *alms* and *riches*, are true Plural forms. How far, in sense, they are Singular is a point not of Etymology, but of Syntax.

Mathematics, *Metaphysics*, *Politics*, *Ethics*, *Optics*, *Physics.*)—The following is an exhibition of my hypothesis respecting these words, to which I invite the reader's criticism. All the words in point are of Greek origin, and all are derived from a Greek Adjective. Each is the name of some department of study, of some art, or of some science. As the words are Greek, so also are the sciences

which they denote, either of Greek origin, or else such as flourished in Greece. Let the arts and sciences of Greece, be expressed, in Greek, rather by a Substantive and an Adjective combined, than by a simple Substantive; for instance, let it be the habit of the language to say *the musical art*, rather than *music*. Let the Greek for *art* be a word in the Feminine Gender; *e. g.* τέχνη (*tekhnæ*), so that the *musical art* be Ἡ μουσίκη τέχνη (*hæ mousikæ tekhnæ*). Let, in the progress of language, (as was actually the case in Greece,) the Article and Substantive be omitted, so that, for the *musical art*, or for *music*, there stand only the Feminine Adjective, μουσίκη. Let there be, upon a given art or science, a series of books, or treatises; the Greek for *Book*, or *Treatise*, being a Neuter Substantive, βίβλιον (*biblion*). Let the Substantive meaning *Treatise* be, in the course of language, omitted, so that whilst the science of Physics is called φυσίκη (*fysikæ*), *physic*, from Ἡ φυσίκη τέχνη, a series of Treatises (or even Chapters) upon the science shall be called φύσικα (*fysika*) or *physics*. Now all this was what happened in Greece. The science was denoted by a Feminine Adjective Singular, as φυσίκη (*fysicæ*), and the Treatises upon it, by the Neuter Adjective Plural, as φύσικα (*fysica*). The Treatises of Aristotle are generally so named. To apply this, I conceive, that in the Middle Ages a science of Greek origin might have its name drawn from two sources, *viz.* from the name of the art or science, or from the name of the books wherein it was treated. In the first case it had a Singular form, as *Physic*, *Logic*; in the second case a Plural form, as *Mathematics*, *Metaphysics*, *Optics*.

In what Number these words, having a collective sense, require their Verbs, is a point not of Etymology, but of Syntax.

Such are the Plural forms in *s* or *z*; of which it may be said that, in respect to frequency, they so far outweigh

the other forms, as to pass in practice for the only Plural forms of our language. This, from the history of our tongue, we scarcely are led to expect. From § 33, it will be seen that in A. S. the letter *s* was the Plural sign in a certain Declension and in a certain Gender only. Neither in the allied languages is *-s* the current sign of the Plural.

§ 140. *The form in -r.*)—In Icelandic no termination of the Plural Number is so common as *r*, whether it be the simple letter *r*, or the syllables *ar*, *ir*, *ur*: *geislar*, flashes; *gumar*, men; *tungur*, tongues, &c. &c. Of this termination we have, perhaps, a representative in the antiquated and provincial form *childer*, the Plural of *child*. This seems to be a true Plural form.

§ 141. *The form in -en.*)—In the A. S. no termination of the Plural Number is so common as *-n*: *tungan*, tongues; *steorran*, stars. Of this termination we have evident remains in the word *oxen*, *hosen*, *shoon*, *eyne*, *welkin*,* words more or less antiquated. This, perhaps, is *no* true Plural.

§ 142. *Men*, *feet*, *teeth*, *mice*, *lice*, *geese*.—In these we have some of the oldest words in the language. If these were, to a certainty, true Plurals, we should have an appearance somewhat corresponding to the weak and strong Tenses of Verbs; *viz.* one series of Plurals formed by a change of the Vowel, and another by the addition of the Sibilant. The word *kye*, used in Scotland for *cows*, is of the same class. The list in A. S. of words of this kind is different from that of the present English.

Sing.	*Plur.*	
Freónd . .	Frýnd . .	*Friends.*
Feónd . .	Fynd . .	*Foes.*
Niht . .	Niht . .	*Nights.*
Bóc . .	Béc . .	*Books.*
Burh . .	Byrig . .	*Burghs.*
Bróc . .	Bréc . .	*Breeches.*
Turf . .	Týrf . .	*Turves.*

* The clouds.

The absence of *n* in the Norse languages, compared with its frequency in Saxon as a sign of the Plural, is remarkable. Section 4, however, has shown that, expressive of the notion conveyed by the Definite Article, the termination *-n* in Norse is very general. Between the ideas of Plurality and Collectiveness there is an evident and a recognized affinity: between the ideas of Collectiveness and the idea expressed by the Definite Article, in such a sentence as the following, where *the man* means *men*, there is, to my mind, an affinity also:

> The man that hath not music in his soul,
> Is fit for treason, stratagem, and spoil.—SHAKESPEARE.

I leave it to professed Anglo-Saxons to determine whether the Plural power of the A. S. and High German *-n* be not derived from either the Definite Article of the Norse, or from some common source. The forms like *men* and the forms like *oxen*, seem to me Collectives rather than true Plurals.

Children.—As *songstress* has a double expression of its Gender (see § 135), so has *children* of its Number, *viz.* 1. the termination *-r*. 2. the termination *-en*.

Brethren.—Here there are two changes. 1. The alteration of the Vowel. 2. The addition *-en*. Collective rather than Plural.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE CASES.

§ 143. THE extent to which there are, in the English language, Cases, depends on the meaning which we attach to the word Case. In the sentence *a house of a father*, the idea expressed by the words *of a father*, is an idea of relation between them and the word *house*. This idea is an idea of Property or Possession. The relation between the words *father* and *house* may be called the Possessive Relation. This relation, or connexion, between the two words is expressed by the Preposition *of*.

In *a father's house* the idea is, there or thereabouts, the same; the relation or connexion between the two words being the same. The expression, however, differs. In *a father's house* the relation, or connexion, is expressed, not by a Preposition, but by a change of form, *father* becoming *father's*.

He gave the house to a father.—Here the words *father* and *house* stand in another sort of relationship; the relationship being expressed by the Preposition *to*. The idea *to a father* differs from the idea *of a father*, in being expressed in one way only; *viz.* by the Preposition. There is no second mode of expressing it by a change of form, as was done with *father's*.

The father taught the child.—Here there is neither Preposition nor Change of Form. The connexion between

the words *father* and *child* is expressed by the arrangement only.

Now if the relation alone between two words constitutes a Case, the words or sentences, *child; to a father; of a father;* and *father's*, are all equally Cases; of which one may be called the Accusative, another the Dative, a third the Genitive, and so on.

Perhaps, however, the relationship alone does not constitute a Case. Perhaps there is a necessity of either the addition of a Preposition (as in *of a father*), or of a change in form (as in *father's*). In this case, (although *child* be not so,) *father's*, *of a father*, and *to a father*, are all equally Cases.

Now it is a remark, at least as old as Dr. Beattie,* that if the use of a Preposition constitute a Case, there must be as many Cases in a language as there are Prepositions, and that "*above a man, beneath a man, beyond a man, round* "*about a man, within a man, without a man,* shall be Cases, "as well as *of a man, to a man,* and *with a man.*"

For Etymological purposes it is necessary to limit the meaning of the word Case; and, as a sort of definition, it may be laid down that *where there is no change of form, there is no Case.* With this remark, the English Language may be compared with the Latin.

		Latin.	*English.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	*Pater* . . .	*a father.*
	Gen.	*Patris* . . .	*a father's.*
	Dat.	*Patri* . . .	*to a father.*
	Acc.	*Patrem* . . .	*a father.*
	Abl.	*Patre* . . .	*from a father.*

Here, since in the Latin language there are five changes of form, whilst in English there are but *two*, there are (as

* Murray's Grammar, vol. i. p. 79.

far, at least, as the word *pater* and *father* are concerned,) three more Cases in Latin than in English. It does not, however, follow that because in *father* we have but two Cases, there may not be other words wherein there are more than two.

In order to constitute a Case there must be a change of form. —This statement is a matter of Definition. A second question, however, arises out of it; *viz.* whether every change of form constitutes a Case? In the Greek language there are the words Ἔριν (*Erin*), and Ἔριδα (*Erida*). Unlike the words *father* and *father's*, these two words have precisely the same meaning. Each is called an Accusative; and each, consequently, is said to be in the same Case with the other. This indicates the statement, that in order to constitute a Case there must be not *only a change of form, but also a change of meaning*. Whether such a limitation of the word be convenient is a question for the general Grammarian.

There is no change of Case unless there is a change of Form. Hence, in respect to the word *patribus* (and others like it), which is sometimes translated *from fathers*, and at other times *to fathers*, we must say, not that in the one case the word is Ablative and in the other Dative but, that a certain Case is used with a certain latitude of meaning. This remark bears on the word *her* in English. In *her book* the sense is that of the Case currently called Genitive. In *it moved her*, the sense is that of the Case currently called the Accusative. If we adhere, however, to what we have laid down, we must take exceptions to this mode of speaking. It is not that out of the single form *her* we can get two Cases, but that a certain Case (or form) has two powers; one that of the Latin Genitive, and another that of the Latin Accusative. This leads to an interesting question; *viz.* what notions are sufficiently allied

to be expressed by the same Case? I am aware that there are certain difficulties that a rigid adherence to this notion of a Case may lead to. The word *her*, in its two senses, may be dealt with as a Single Case, because the notions conveyed by the Genitive and Accusative are sufficiently allied to be expressed by the same word. Are the notions, however, *of a mistress*, and *mistresses*, so allied? I think not; and yet in the Latin language the same form *dominæ* expresses both. Of *dominæ* = *of a mistress*, and of *dominæ* = *mistresses*, we cannot say that there is one and the same Case with a latitude of meaning. The words were, perhaps, once different. And this leads to the distinction between *a real and an accidental identity of form.*

In the language of the Anglo-Saxons the Genitive Case of the words *smith* (*smið*), *end* (*ende*), and *day* (*dæg*), was respectively, *smithes* (*smiðes*), *endes*, and *dayes* (*dæges*); whilst the Nominative Plural was, respectively, *smithas* (*smiðas*), *endas*, and *dayas* (*dægas*). A process of change took place, by which the Vowel of the last Syllable in each word was ejected. The result was, that the forms of the Genitive Singular and the Nominative Plural became one and the same. The identity of the two Cases is an accident.

This fact relieves the English Grammarian of a difficulty. The Nominative Plural and the Genitive Singular are, in the present language of England, identical; the comma in *father's* being a mere matter of Orthography. Adhering to what has gone before, we must treat these two different notions as one and the same Case, their forms being the same. However, there was *once* a difference. This modifies the previous statement, which may now stand thus:—*for a change of Case there must be a change of form existing or presumed.*

§ 144. *The number of our Cases and the extent of language*

over which they spread.)—In the English language there is undoubtedly a *Nominative* Case. This occurs in Substantives, Adjectives, and Pronouns (*father*, *good*, *he*) equally. It is found in both Numbers.

Accusative.)—Some call this the Objective Case. The words *him* (Singular) and *them* (Plural), (whatever they may have been originally,) are now true Accusatives. The Accusative Case is found in Pronouns only. *Thee*, *me*, *us*, and *you* are true Accusatives.

Dative.—In the antiquated word *whilom* (*at times*), we have a remnant of the old Dative in *-m*. The *sense* of the word is adverbial; its form, however, is that of a Dative Case. *Seldom*, also is, in English, as true a *Dative* as *raro* is, in Latin. It is difficult, however, to say to what Number the words *whilom* and *seldom* belong.

Genitive.—Some call this the Possessive Case. It is found in Substantives and Pronouns (*father's*, *his*), but not in Adjectives. It is formed like the Nominative Plural, by the addition of the Lene Sibilant (*father*, *fatherz*; *buck*, *bucks*); or if the word ends in *s*, by that of *-es*, *boxes*, *judges*, &c. &c. It is found in both Numbers; *the men's hearts*; *the children's bread.* In the Plural Number, however, it is rare; so rare, indeed, that wherever the Plural ends in *s* (as it always does), there is no Genitive. If it were not so, we should have such words as *fatherses*, *foxeses*, &c. &c.

Ablative.)—Of this we have a remnant in the Adverbs *how* and *why*.

§ 145. *The Origin of Cases.*—"The words *him* and "*them*, *whatever they may have been originally*, are *now* true "Accusatives."—The words in italics were added for the sake of foreshadowing the present section. It is not certain that the words in question were always Accusatives.

How do we determine Cases? In other words, why do

we call *him* and *them* Accusatives rather than Datives or Genitives? By one of two means; *viz.* either by the Sense or the Form.

Suppose that in the English language there were ten thousand Dative Cases and as many Accusatives. Suppose, also, that all the Dative Cases ended in *-m*, and all the Accusatives in some other letter. It is very evident that, whatever might be the meaning of the words *him* and *them*, their form would be Dative. In this case the meaning being Accusative, and the form Dative, we should doubt which test to take.

My own opinion is, that it would be convenient to determine Cases by the *form* of the word *alone;* so that, even if a word had a Dative sense only once, where it had an Accusative sense ten thousand times, such a word should be said to be in the Dative Case. Now the words *him* and *them* (to which we may add *her* and *whom*) were once Dative Cases; *-m* in A. S. being the sign of the Dative Case. In the time of the Anglo-Saxons, their sense coincided with their form. At present, they are Dative forms with an Accusative meaning. Still, as the word *give* takes after it a Dative Case, we have, even now, in the sentence, *give it him*, *give it her*, *give it them*, remnants of the old Dative sense. To say *give it to him*, *to her*, *to them*, is unnecessary and pedantic: neither do I object to the expression, *whom shall I give it?* If ever the *formal* test become generally recognized and consistently adhered to, *him*, *them*, *her*, and *whom*, will be called Datives with a latitude of meaning; and then the only true Accusatives in the English language will be the forms *you*, *thee*, *us*, *me*, and one or two others.

My, an Accusative form, (*meh*, *me*, *mec*,) has now a Genitive sense. The same may be said of *thy*.

Me, originally an Accusative form, (both *me* and *my* can

grow out of *mec* and *meh*,) had, even with the Anglo-Saxons, a Dative sense. *Give it me* is correct English. The same may be said of *thee*.

Him, a Dative form, has now an Accusative sense.

Her, a Dative form (A. S. *hire*), had, even with the Anglo-Saxons, a Genitive sense; whilst with us it has, in addition, an Accusative one. In the history of words like these, we can study what may be called the Logical Affinity of Cases.

When all traces of the original Dative signification are effaced, and when all the Dative Cases in a language are similarly affected, an Accusative Case may be said to have originated out of a Dative. Thus far the question has been concerning the immediate origin of Cases: their remote origin is a different matter.

The word *um* occurs in Icelandic. In Danish and Swedish it is *om;* in the Germanic languages *omme*, *umbi*, *umpi*, *ymbe*, and also *um*. Its meaning is *at*, *on*, *about*. The word *whilom* is the Substantive *while*, *a time or pause*, (Dan. *hvile*, *to rest*,) with the addition of the Preposition *om*. That the particular Dative form in *om* has arisen out of the Noun *plus* the Preposition is a safe assertion. I am not prepared, however, to account for the formation of all the Cases in this manner.

§ 146. *Analysis of Cases.*—In the word *children's* we are enabled to separate the word into three parts. 1. The root *child*. 2. The Plural signs *r* and *en*. 3. The sign of the Genitive Case, *s*. In this case, the word is said to be analysed, since we not only take it to pieces, but also give the respective powers of each of its elements; stating which denotes the Case, and which the Number. Although it is too much to say that every Case of every Number can be thus analysed, it is not too much to say, that such can be done far more frequently than is imagined.

§ 147. *The true Nature of the Genitive form in s.*—It is a common notion that the Genitive form *father's* is contracted from *father his*. The expression in our Liturgy, *for Jesus Christ his sake*, which is merely a Pleonastic one, is the only foundation for this assertion. As the idea, however, is not only one of the commonest, but also one of the greatest errors in Etymology, the following three statements are given for the sake of contradiction to it.

1. The expression the *Queen's Majesty* is not capable of being reduced to the *Queen his Majesty*.

2. In the form *his* itself, the *s* has precisely the power that it has in *father's*, &c. &c. Now *his* cannot be said to arise out of *he* + *his*.

3. In all the languages of the vast Indo-European tribe the Genitive ends in *s*, just as it does in English; so that even if the words *father his* would account for the English word *father's*, it would not account for the Sanskrit Genitive *pad-as*, of a foot; the Zend *dughdhar-s*, of a daughter; the Lithuanic *dugter-s*; the Greek ὀδοντ-ος; the Latin *dent-is*, &c. &c. &c.

For further remarks upon the English Genitive, see the Cambridge Philological Museum, vol. ii. p. 246.

CHAPTER V.

THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

§ 148. *I, thou, we, ye, us, me.* These constitute the true Personal Pronouns. From *he, she,* and *it,* they differ in being destitute of Gender.

These latter words are Demonstrative rather than Personal, so that there are, in English, true Personal Pronouns for the two First Persons only.

In other languages the current Pronouns of the Third Person are, as in English, Demonstrative rather than Personal. The reflective form *se,* common to all the Genders, is, however, truly Personal. This form is wanting in English.

The current Declension of the Personal Pronouns is exceptionable. *I, we,* and *me; thou,* and *ye,* stand in no etymological relations to each other. The true view of the words is that they are not Irregular but Defective. *I* has no *oblique,* and *me* no Nominative Case. And so in respect to the rest.

I, in German *ich,* Icelandic *ic,* corresponds with ἐγώ, and *ego* of the Classical Languages; *ego* and ἐγώ being, like *I,* defective in the oblique cases.

The sound of *m* (as in *me*) is characteristic of the oblique cases, not in the Indo-European languages alone (as it is throughout), but in the Finlandic languages also,

e. g. mina, I; in which it has this peculiarity, *viz.* it is used in the Nominative Case as well.

My, as stated above, is a form originally Accusative, but now used in a Genitive sense.

Me.—In Anglo-Saxon this was called a Dative form. The fact seems to be that both *my* and *me* grew out of an Accusative form, *meh*, *mec*.

That the sound of *k* originally belonged to the Pronouns *me* and *thee*, we learn not only from the A. S. *mec*, *þec*, *meh*, *þeh*, but from the Icelandic *mik*, *þik*, and the German *mich*, *dich*. This accounts for the form *my;* since *y* = *ey*, and the sounds of *y* and *g* are allied. That both *me* and *my* can be evolved from *mik*, we see in the present Scandinavian language, where, very often even in the same district, *mig* is pronounced both *mey* and *mee*.

We and *our.*—These words are not in the condition of *I* and *me*. Although the fact be obscured, they are really in an etymological relation to each other. This we infer from the alliance between the sounds of *w* and *ou*, and from the Danish forms *vi* (*we*), *vor* (*our*). It may be doubted, however, whether *our* be a true Genitive, rather than an Adjectival form. In the form *ours*, we find it playing the part, not of a Case, but of an independent word. Upon this, however, too much stress cannot be laid. In Danish it takes a Neuter form: *vor*, *noster;* *vort*, *nostrum*. From this, I conceive that it agrees, not with the Latin Genitive *nostrûm*, but with the Adjective *noster*.

Us, *we*, *our.*—Even *us* is in an etymological relation to *we*. That *we* and *our* are so, has just been shown. Now in A. S. there were two forms of *our*, *viz. úre*, and *user*. This connects *we* and *us*, through *our*.

From these preliminary notices we have the changes in form of the true Personal Pronouns as follows:—

1ST PERSON.

1*st Term.* (*for Nominative Singular.*)
I. Undeclined.
2*nd Term.* (*for Oblique Cases of the Singular Number.*)
Acc. *Me.* Gen. *My.* Form in *n*—*Mine.*
3*rd Term.* (*for the Plural Number.*)
Nom. *We.* Acc. *Us.* Form in *r*—*Our, ours.*

2ND PERSON.

1*st Term.* (*for the Singular Number.*)
Nom. *Thou.* Acc. *Thee.* Gen. *Thy.* Form in *n*—*Thine.*
2*nd Term.* (*for the Plural Number.*)
Nom. *Ye.* Acc. *You.* Form in *r*—*Your, yours.*

§ 149. *Forms in* n *and* r.—The current Genitive of the Anglo-Saxons was *mín*, *þín*. Were these true Cases corresponding with *mei*, *tui*, or were they Adjectival forms corresponding with *meus* and *tuus?* Most probably the latter, since, in the Norse, they are Declined, Masc. *mín*, *þín*, Neuter, *mitt*, *þitt*. This view, however, is qualified by a reference to the rest of the Indo-European tongues. In Sanskrit we find *mama*, in Zend *mana*, in Lithuanic *manens*, in Old Slavonic *mene*, all treated by the Grammarians* as Genitive Cases. Even these, however, may be Adjectival; since we have nowhere else the letter *n* as the true sign of the Genitive.

On these grounds the words *mine* and *thine* have been called the forms in *n*, rather than either Genitive Cases, or Adjectives.

The same applies to *your* and *our*. In Norse these forms are declined. *Our* is declined in Anglo-Saxon. These are called the forms in *r*.

§ 150. *We* and *me* have been dealt with as distinct words. For practical purposes, it may be considered that they stand in no etymological relation to each other; in other

* Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik, p. 482.

words, that the Plural of the First Person is expressed by one word, and the Singular by another. The sounds, however, of *m* and *w* are allied, and in Sanskrit the Singular form *ma* = *I*, is looked upon as part of the same word with *vayam* = *we*. The same is the case with the Greek με (*me*), and the Plural form ἡμεῖς (*hæmeis*) = *we*.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS, &c. &c.

§ 151. THE Demonstrative Pronouns are, 1. *He, she, it.* 2. *This, that.* 3. The Article *the.*

He, she, and *it,* generally looked on as Personal, are here treated as Demonstrative Pronouns for the following reasons.

1. The Personal Pronouns form an extremely natural class, if the Pronouns of the two first Persons (and *se* when found in the language) be taken by themselves. This is not the case if they be taken along with *he, she,* and *it.* The absence of Gender, the peculiarity in their Declension, and their Defectiveness are marked characters wherein they agree with each other, but not with any other words.

2. The idea expressed by *he, she,* and *it* is naturally that of Demonstrativeness. In the Latin language *is, ea, id; ille, illa, illud; hic, hæc, hoc,* are Demonstrative Pronouns in Sense, as well as in Declension.

3. The Plural forms *they, them,* in the present English, are the Plural forms of the word *that,* a true Demonstrative Pronoun; so that even if *he, she,* and *it* could be treated as Personal Pronouns, it could only be in the Singular Number.

4. The word *she* has grown out of the A. S. *seó.* Now *seó* was in Anglo-Saxon the Feminine form of the Definite Article; the Definite Article being a Demonstrative Pronoun.

Compared with the A. S. the present English stands as follows:—

She.—The A. S. form *heó*, being lost to the language, is replaced by the Feminine Article *seó*.

Her.—This is a case, not of the present *she*, but of the A. S. *heó*: so that *she* may be said to be Defective in the Oblique Cases, and *her* to be Defective in the Nominative.

Him.—A true Dative form, which has replaced the A. S. *hine*. When used as a Dative, it was Neuter as well as Masculine.

His.—Originally Neuter as well as Masculine. Now replaced by *its*.

It.—Changed from the A. S. *hit*, by the ejection of *h*. The *t* is no part of the original word, but a sign of the Neuter Gender, forming it regularly from *he*. The same Neuter sign is preserved in the Latin *id* and *illud*.

Its.—In the course of time the nature of the Neuter sign *t*, in *it*, the form being found in but a few words, became misunderstood. Instead of being looked on as an Affix, it passed for part of the original word. Hence was formed from *it* the anomalous Genitive *its*, superseding the Saxon *his*. The same was the case with

Hers.—The *r* is no part of the original word, but the sign of the Dative Case. These formations are of value in the history of Cases.

They, their, them.—When *hit* had been changed into *it*, when *heó* had been replaced by *she*, and when the single form *the*, as an Article, had come to serve for all the Cases of all the Genders, two circumstances took place: 1. The forms *þám* and *þára* as Definite Articles, or as true Demonstratives, became superfluous; and, 2. the connexion between the Plural forms *hí*, *heom*, *heora*, and the Singular forms *he* and *it*, grew indistinct. Hence arose the form *they*, *them*, and *their*, instead of *hí*, *heom*, *heora*.

Theirs.—In the same predicament with *hers* and *its;* either the Case of an Adjective, or a Case formed from a Case.

Than or *then*, and *there.*—Although now Adverbs, once Demonstrative Pronouns, in a certain Case and in a certain Gender.

An exhibition of the A. S. Declension is the best explanation of the English. Be it observed, that the Cases marked in italics are found in the present language.

I.

Se—*Seó.*

Of this word we meet two forms only, both of the Singular Number, and both in the Nominative Case; *viz.* Masc. *se* (*the*); Fem. *seó* (the). The Neuter Gender and the other Cases of the Article were taken from the Pronoun *þæt* (*that*).

II.

þæt (*that, the*), and *þis* (*this*).

		Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*	*Neut.*	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Sing.	Nom.	*þæt*	—	—	*þis*	*þes*	*þeós.*
	Acc.	*þæt*	*þone*	*þâ.*	*þis*	*þisne*	*þás.*
	Abl.	*þy*	*þy*	*þæ're.*	*þise*	*þise*	*þisse.*
	Dat.	*þám*	*þám*	*þæ're.*	*þisum*	*þisum*	*þisse.*
	Gen.	*þæs*	*þæs*	*þæ're.*	*þises*	*þises*	*þisse.*
Plur.	Nom. Acc.		*þá?*			*þás?*	
	Abl. Dat.		*þám.*			*þisum.*	
	Gen.		*þára.*			*þissa.*	

III.

Hit (it), *he* (he), *heó* (she).

Sing.	Nom.	*hit*	*he*	heó.
	Acc.	*hit*	hine	hí.
	Dat.	*him*	*him*	*hire.*
	Gen.	*his*	*his*	*hire.*
Plur.	Nom. Acc.		hi.	
	Dat.		him (heom).	
	Gen.		hira (heora).	

IV.

þe (*the*)—Undeclined, and used for all Cases and Genders.

Those.—The Note of Interrogation after the forms *þá* and *þás* indicated a difficulty. Form for form, the word *those* is the same as *þás*. If it be not so, we must account for the addition of the *s*. Meaning for meaning, the word *those* is anything rather than the Plural of *this*.

These.—In this word, the *s* being in every Case, Gender, and Number, is no sign of the Plural. As far as its form is concerned, it must be classed with the words *geese*, *men*, &c. &c., wherein the Plural is formed from the Singular by a change of Vowel. Respecting, however, these two words, I have nothing very satisfactory.

The present Declension of the Demonstrative Pronouns is as follows:—

I.

The—Undeclined.

II.

She—Defective in the Oblique Cases.

III.

HE.

	Masc.	*Neut.*	*Fem.*
Nom.	He	It (from *hit*)	—
Acc.	Him	It	Her.
Dat.	Him	—	Her.
Gen.	His	—	Her.
Secondary Gen.	—	Its	Hers.

No Plural form.

IV.

THAT.

		Neut.	*Masc.*	*Fem.*
Sing.	*Nom.*	That	—	—
	Acc.	That	Than*	—
	Dat.	—	—	There.*
Plur.	*Nom.*	—	They.†	
	Acc.	—	Them.†	
	Gen.	—	Their.†	
Secondary Gen.		—	Theirs.†	

* Used as Adverbs.

† Used as the Plurals of *He*, *She*, and *It*.

V.

Singular, This. *Plural*, These.

VI.

Of uncertain origin.

Those.

These seems Collective rather than Plural. As opposed to *those*, it gives the idea of Nearness; the point from whence we measure being the person speaking. Things that are near one and the same object, are necessarily near each other; and things that are near each other, are liable to be dealt with in the mass.

§ 152. In the Relative and Interrogative Pronouns, *who*, *what*, *whom*, *whose*, we have, expressed by a change of form, a Neuter Gender, *what;* a Dative Case, *whom;* and a Genitive Case, *whose:* the true power of the *s* (*viz.* as the sign of a Case) being obscured by the orthographical addition of the *e* mute.

To these may be added, 1. The Adverbs *how* and *why*, the same words, and originally the Ablative form *hvi* (*quo modo? quâ viâ?*). 2. The Adverb *where*, a Feminine Dative, like *there*. 3. *When*, a Masculine Accusative, (in A. S. *hwone* or *hwœne*,) and analogous to *then*.

§ 153. The following points in the history of the Demonstrative and Relative Pronouns are taken from Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, vol. iii. pp. 1, 2, 3.

Throughout the Indo-European tribe the Interrogative or Relative idea is expressed by *k*, or by a modification of *k; e. g. qu*, *hv*, or *h;* as Sansk. *kas*, who; *kataras*, which of two; *katama*, which of many.—Lithuanic, *kas*, who; *koks*, of what sort; *kokelys*, how great; *kaip*, how.—Slavonic, *kto*, who, Russ. and Polish; *kdo*, who, Bohemian; *koto-ry*, which, R.; *kolik*, how great.—*Quot*, *qualis*, *quantus*, Latin.—Κόσος, κοῖος, κότε, Ionic Greek; in the other dialects, however, πότερος, πόσος, &c. &c.—Gothic; *hvas*, who,

M. G.; *huer*, O. H. G.; *hvaþar*, which of two, M. G.; *huëdar*, O. H. G.; *hvem*, *hvad*, *huanne*, *huar*, N.; *what*, *why*, *which*, *where*, &c. English.

Throughout the Indo-European tribe, the Demonstrative idea is expressed by *t*, or by a modification of it; as, Sanskrit, *tat*, that; *tata-ras*, such a one out of two. —Lithuanic, *tas*, he; *toks*, such; *tokelys*, so great; *taip*, so. —Slavonic, *t'* or *ta*, he; *taku*, such; *tako*, so.—*Tot*, *talis*, *tantum*, Lat.—Τόσος, τοῖος, τότε, Greek; *this*, *that*, *thus*, English, &c. &c.

The two sounds in the Danish words *hvi*, *hvad*, &c. &c. and the two sounds in the English, *what*, *when*, (A. S. *hwæt*, *hwæne*,) account for the forms *why* and *how*. In the first the *w* alone, in the second the *h* alone, is sounded. The Danish for *why* is *hvi*, pronounced *vi;* in Swedish the word is *hu*.

§ 154. The following remarks (some of them not strictly etymological) apply to a few of the remaining Pronouns. For further details, see Grimm, iii. 4.

Same.—Wanting in A. S., where it was replaced by the word *ylca*, *ylce*. Probably derived from the Norse.

Self.—In *myself*, *thyself*, *herself*, *ourselves*, *yourselves*, a Substantive (or with a Substantival power), and preceded by a Genitive Case. In *himself* and *themselves* an Adjective (or with an Adjectival power), and preceded by an Accusative Case. *Itself* is equivocal, since we cannot say whether its elements are *it* and *self*, or *its* and *self;* the *s* having been dropped in utterance. It is very evident that either the form like *himself*, or the form like *thyself*, is exceptionable; in other words, that the use of the word is inconsistent. As this inconsistency is as old the Anglo-Saxons, the history of the word gives us no elucidation. In favour of the forms like *myself*, (*self* being a Substantive,) are the following facts:—

1. The Plural word *selves*, a Substantival, and not an Adjectival form.

2. The Middle High German phrases, *min lîp*, *dîn lîp*, *my body*, *thy body*, equivalent in sense to *myself*, *thyself*. The word *beye* is similarly used in Manchoo.

3. The circumstance that if *self* be dealt with as a Substantive, such phrases as *my own self*, *his own great self*, &c. &c. can be used; whereby the language is a gainer.

4. The fact that many persons actually say *hisself* and *theirselves*.

Whit.—As in the phrase, *not a whit*. This enters in the Compound Pronouns *aught* and *naught*.

One.—As in the phrase, *one does so and so*. From the French *on*. Observe that this is from the Latin *homo*, in Old French *hom*, *om*. In the Germanic tongues *man* is used in the same sense: *Man sagt = one says = on dit*.

Derived Pronouns.—Any, in A. S. *ænig*. In O. H. G. we have *einîc*, *any*, and *einac*, *single*. In A. S. *ânega* means *single*. In M. H. G. *einec* is always *single*. In N. H. G. *einig* means, 1. *a certain person* (*quidam*), 2. *agreeing*; *einzig*, meaning *single*. In Dutch *ênech* has both meanings. This indicates the word *án*, *one*, as the root of the word in question. Grimm, iii. 9.

Compound Pronouns.—Which, as has been already stated more than once, is most incorrectly called the Neuter of *who*. Instead of being a Neuter, it is a compound word. The Adjective *leiks*, *like*, is preserved in the Mœso-Gothic words *galeiks*, and *missaleiks*. In O. H. G. the form is *lîh*, in A. S. *lic*. Hence we have M. G. *hvêleiks*; O. H. G. *huëlîh*; A. S. *huilic* and *hvilc*; Old Frisian, *hwelik*; Dan. *hvilk-en*; German, *welch*; Scotch, *whilk*; English, *which*. (Grimm, iii. 47.) The same is the case with

1. *Such.*—M. G. *svaleiks*; O. H. G. *sôlîh*; Old Saxon, *sulic*; A. S. *svilc*; Germ. *solch*; English *such*. (Grim, iii.

48.) Rask's derivation of the A. S. *swilc* from *swa-ylc*, is exceptionable.

2. *Thilk.* — An Old English word, found in the provincial dialects, as *thick*, *thuck*, *theck*, and hastily derived by Tyrwhitt, Ritson, and Weber, from *së ylca*, is found in the following forms: M. G. *þéleiks;* Norse, *þvílikr.* (Grimm, iii. 49.)

3. *Ilk.*—Found in the Scotch, and always preceded by the Article; *the ilk*, or *that ilk*, meaning *the same.* In A. S. this word is *ylca*, preceded also by the Article, *se ylca*, *seó ylce*, *þæt ylce.* In English, as seen above, the word is replaced by *same.* In no other Gothic dialect does it occur. According to Grimm, this is no simple word, but a compound one, of which some such word as *ei* is the first, and *lic* the second element. D. G. iii. 50.

Aught.—In Mœso-Gothic is found the Particle *aiv*, *ever*, but only in negative propositions; *ni* (*not*) preceding it. Its O. H. G. form is *êo*, *io;* in M. H. G. *ie*, in N. H. G. *je*, in O. S. *io*, in A. S. *â*, in Norse *æ.* Combined with this Particle the word *whit* (*thing*) gives the following forms: O. H. G. *êowiht;* A. S. *âviht;* Old Fr. *âwet;* English, *aught.* The word *naught* is *aught* preceded by the Negative Particle. D. G. iii. 52.

Each.—The Particle *gi* enters, like the Particle in the composition of Pronouns. O. H. G. *êogalîhpér*, every one; *êocalih*, all; M. H. G. *iegelich;* N. H. G. *jeglich;* A. S. *ælc;* English, *each;* the *l* being dropped, as in *which* and *such.* *Ælc*, as the original of the English *each* and the Scotch *ilka*,* must by no means be confounded with the word *ylce*, *the same.* Grimm, iii. 54.

Every, in O. E. *everich*, *everech*, *everilk one*, is *ælc*, preceded by the particle *ever.* Grimm, iii. 54.

Either.—O. H. G. *éogahuëdar;* M. H. G. *iegewëder;* A. S. *æghvæðer*, *ægðer;* Old Frisian, *eider.*

* Different from *ilk.*

Neither.—The same with the Negative Article prefixed. *Neither: either* : : *naught: aught.*

Other, whether.—These words, although derived forms, being simpler than some that have preceded, might fairly have been dealt with before. They make, however, a transition from the present to the succeeding Chapter, and so find a place here.

A. *First*, it may be stated of them that the idea which they express is not that *of one out of many*, but that of *one out of two.*

1. In Sanskrit there are two forms, [a],) *kataras*, the same word as *whether*, meaning *which out of two;* [b]) *katamas, which out of many.* So also *êkateras, one out of two; êkatamas, one out of many.* In Greek, the Ionic form κότερος (πότερος); in Latin, *uter, neuter, alter;* and in M.G. *hvathar*, have the same form and the same meaning.

2. In the Scandinavian language the word *anden*, D. S. *annar*, Icl. corresponds to the English word *second*, and to the German *zweite: e. g. Karl den Anden, Charles the Second.* Now *anthar* is the older form *of other.*

B. *Secondly*, it may be stated of them, that the termination *-er* is the same termination that we find in the Comparative Degree.

1. The idea expressed by the Comparative Degree is the Comparison, not of *many*, but of *two* things; *this is better than that.*

2. In all the Indo-European languages where there are Pronouns in *-ter*, there is also a Comparative Degree in *-ter.* See next Chapter.

3. As the Sanskrit form *kataras* corresponds with the Comparative Degree, where there is the Comparison of *two things with each other;* so the word *katamas* is a Superlative form; and in the Superlative Degree lies the Comparison of *many* things with each other. See Chapters VII. and VIII.

Hence *other* and *whether* (to which may be added *either* and *neither*) are Pronouns with the Comparative form.

Other has the additional peculiarity of possessing the Plural form *others*. Hence, like *self*, it is, in the strictest sense, a Substantival Pronoun.

CHAPTER VII.

THE COMPARATIVE DEGREE.

§ 155. THE Degrees of Comparison present to the Grammarian so many difficulties, that it is only by means of a view extended over the whole Indo-European tribe of languages that we attain a satisfactory elucidation.

In the Sanskrit language the signs of the Comparative Degree are two: 1. *-tara*, as *punya*, pure; *punya-tara*, purer: 2. *-îyas*, as *ks'ipra*, swift; *ks'épîyas*, swifter. Of these it is the first that in the Sanskrit is the most in use.

The same forms occur in the Zend; as *husko*, dry; *hus-kôtara*, drier; *-îyas*, however, is changed into *-is*.

In the Classical languages we have the same forms. 1. in *uter*, *neuter*, *alter*, Lat. (see § 154); and in ποτερος, λεπτότερος, Greek. 2. In the Adverb *magis*, Lat. The Slavonic word *koteryi*, *which of two*, with a few others, exhibits the form in *r*; whilst in Bohemian and Polish *ssj* and *szy* correspond with the Sanskrit forms *îyas*. In Lithuanic we have *antras* and *katras*, fragmentary forms.

We collect from what has preceded, that, expressive of the Comparative Degree, there are two parallel forms; *viz.* the form in *tr* and the form in *s*, of which one is the most in use in one language, and the other in another. Neither in any Indo-European language does any other sign, except these two, ever occur; the Lithuanic form *gerésnis*, *better*, from *geras*, *good*, being accounted for otherwise.

Before we consider the Gothic forms of the Comparative,

it may be advisable to note two changes to which it is liable. 1. The change of *s* into *r;* the Latin word *meliorem* being supposed to have been originally *meliosem*, and the *s* in *nigrius*, *firmius*, &c. being considered not so much the sign of the Neuter Gender as the Old Comparative *s* in its oldest form. 2. The ejection of *t*, as in the Latin words *inferus*, *superus*, compared with the Greek λεπτότερος (*leptoteros*).

§ 156. Now of the two parallel forms, the Gothic one was the form *s;* the words *other* and *whether* only preserving the form *tr*. And here comes the application of the remarks that have just gone before. The vast majority of our Comparatives end in *r*, and so seem to come from *tr* rather than from *s*. This, however, is not the case. The *r* in words like *sweeter* is derived, not from *tar* – *t*, but from *s* the Sibilant, changed into *r* the Liquid. In Mœso-Gothic the Comparative ended in *s* (*z*); in O. H. G. the *s* had become *r;* M. G. *aldiza*, *batiza*, *sutiza;* O. H. G. *altiro*, *betsiro*, *suatsiro;* Eng. *older*, *better*, *sweeter*.

The importance of a knowledge of the form in *s* is appreciated when we learn that, even in the present English, there are vestiges of it.

Comparison of Adverbs.) — *The sun shines bright.* Herein the word *bright* means *brightly;* and although the use of the latter word would have been the more elegant, the expression is not ungrammatical; the word *bright* being looked upon as an Adjectival Adverb.

The sun shines to-day brighter than it did yesterday, and to-morrow it will shine brightest.—Here also the sense is Adverbial; from whence we get the fact, that Adverbs take degrees of Comparison.

Let the root *mag-*, as in *magnus*, μέγας, and *mikil*, Norse, give the idea of greatness; in the Latin Language we have from it two Comparative forms, 1. The Adjectival Com-

parative *major*, greater; 2. The Adverbial Comparative *magis*, more (*plus*). The same takes place in Mœso-Gothic: *maiza*, means *greater*, and is Adjectival; *mais* means *more*, and is Adverbial. The Anglo-Saxon forms are more instructive still; *e.g.* *þäs þe mâ*, *all the more*; *þäs þé bet*, *all the better*, have a Comparative sense, but not a Comparative form, the sign *r* being absent. Now compared with *major*, and subject to the remarks that have gone before, the Latin *magis* is the older form. With *mâ* and *bet*, compared with *more* and *better*, this may or may not be the case. *Ma* and *bet* may each be one of two forms; 1. A Positive used in a Comparative sense; 2. A true Comparative, which has lost its termination. The present Section has been written not for the sake of exhausting the subject, but to show that in the Comparative Degree there were often two forms; of which one, the Adverbial, was either more antiquated, or more imperfect than the other: a fact bearing upon some of the forthcoming trains of Etymological reasoning.

§ 157. *Change of Vowel.*—By reference to Rask's Grammar, § 128, it may be seen that in the Anglo-Saxon there were, of the Comparative and Superlative Degrees, two forms; *viz.* *-or* and *-re*, and *-ost* and *-est*, respectively.

By reference to § 87 of the present Volume, it may be seen that the fulness or smallness of a Vowel in a given syllable may work a change in the nature of the Vowel in a syllable adjoining; as in *instituo* from *in* and *statuo*, where *a* is changed to *i*. In the A. S. the following words exhibit a change of Vowel.

Positive.	*Comparative.*	*Superlative.*	
Lang,	Lengre,	Lengest.	*Long.*
Strang,	Strengre,	Strengest.	*Strong.*
Geong,	Gyngre,	Gyngest.	*Young.*
Sceort,	Scyrtre,	Scyrtest.	*Short.*
Heáh,	Hyrre,	Hyhst.	*High.*
Eald,	Yldre,	Yldest.	*Old.*

Of this change the word last quoted is a still-existing specimen, as *old*, *elder*, and *older*, *eldest*, and *oldest*. Between the two forms there is a difference in meaning, *elder* being used as a Substantive, and having a Plural form, *elders*.

§ 158. *Excess of expression.*—Of this two samples have already been given: 1. In words like *songstress* (§ 135, 6); 2. In words like *children*. This may be called *excess of expression*, the Feminine Gender, in words like *songstress*, and the Plural Number, in words like *children*, being expressed twice over. In the vulgarism *betterer* for *better*, and in the antiquated forms *worser* for *worse*, and *lesser* for *less*, we have, in the Case of the Comparatives, as elsewhere, an excess of expression. In the O. H. G. we have the forms *betsërôro*, *mêrôro*, *érërëra* = *better*, *more*, *ere*.

Better.)—Although in the Superlative form *best*, there is a slight variation from the strict form of that Degree, the word *better* is perfectly regular. So far, then, from truth are the current statements that the Comparison of the words *good*, *better*, and *best* is irregular. The Inflection is not Irregular, but Defective. As the statement that applies to *good*, *better*, and *best* applies to many words besides, it will be well in this place, once for all, to exhibit it in full.

Difference between a Sequence in Logic and a Sequence in Etymology.—The ideas or notions of *thou*, *thy*, *thee*, are ideas between which there is a metaphysical or logical connexion. The train of such ideas may be said to form a sequence, and such a sequence may be called a Logical one.

The forms (or words) *thou*, *thy*, *thee*, are forms or words between which there is a formal or an Etymological connexion. A train of such words may be called a sequence, and such a sequence may be called an Etymological one.

In the case of *thou*, *thy*, *thee*, the Etymological sequence tallies with the Logical one.

The ideas of *I*, *my*, and *me* are also in a Logical sequence: but the forms *I*, *my*, and *me* are not altogether in an Etymological one.

In the case of *I*, *my*, *me*, the Etymological sequence does *not* tally (or tallies imperfectly) with the Logical one.

This is only another way of saying that between the words *I* and *me* there is no connexion in Etymology.

It is also only another way of saying, that in the Oblique Cases, *I*, and, in the Nominative Case, *me*, are Defective.

Now the same is the case with *good*, *better*; *bad*, *worse*, &c. &c. &c. *Good* and *bad* are Defective in the Comparative and Superlative Degrees; *better* and *worse* are Defective in the Positive; whilst between *good* and *better*, *bad* and *worse*, there is a sequence in Logic, but no sequence in Etymology.

To return, however, to the word *better;* no absolute Positive Degree is found in any of the allied languages, and in none of the allied languages is there found any Comparative form of *good.* Its root occurs in the following Adverbial forms: M. G. *bats;* O. H. G. *pats;* Old S. and A. S. *bet;* M. H. G. *baz;* Middle Dutch, *bat*, *bet.*—Grimm, iii. 604.

Worse.—M. G. *vairsiza;* O. H. G. *wirsiro;* M. H. G. *wirser;* Old Saxon, *wirso;* A. S. *vyrsa;* Old Norse, *vërri;* Dan. *værre;* and Sw. *värre.* Such are the Adjectival forms. The Adverbial forms are M. G. *vairs;* O. H. G. *wirs;* M. H. G. *wirs;* A. S. *vyrs;* Old Norse, *vërr;* Dan. *værre;* Sw. *värre.*—Grimm, iii. 606. Whether the present form in English be originally Adjectival or Adverbial is indifferent; since as soon as the final *a* of *vyrsa* was omitted, the two words would be the same. The forms, however, *vairsiza*, *wirser*, *worse*, and *vërri*, make the word one of the most perplexing in the language.

If the form *worse* be taken without respect to the rest,

the view of the matter is simply that in the termination *s*, we have a remnant of the Mœso-Gothic forms, like *sutiza*, &c. &c.; in other words, the old Comparative in *s*.

Wirser and *vairsiza* traverse this view. They indicate the likelihood of the *s* being no sign of the Degree, but a part of the original word. Otherwise the *r* in *wirser*, and the *z* in *vairsiza* denote an excess of expression.

The analogies of *songstress*, *children*, and *betsërôro* show that excess of expression frequently occurs.

The analogy of *mâ* and *bet* show that *worse* may possibly be a Positive form.

The word *vërri* indicates the belief that the *s* is no part of the root;

Whilst the Euphonic processes of the Scandinavian languages tell us that even had there been an *s*, it would, in all probability, have been ejected. These difficulties verify the statement that the word *worse* is one of the most perplexing in the language.

Much, *more*.—Here, although the words be unlike each other, there is a true Etymological relation. M. G. *mikils;* O. H. G. *mihhil;* Old Sax. *mikil;* A. S. *mycel;* O. Norse, *mickill;* Scotch, *muckle* and *mickle*, (all ending in *l*)—Dan. *megen*, M.; *meget*, N.; Sw. *mycken*, M.; *mycket*, N. (where no *l* is found). Such is the Adjectival form of the Positive, rarely found in the Modern Gothic languages, being replaced in German by *gross*, in English by *great*, in Danish by *stor*. The Adverbial forms are *miök* and *miög*, Norse; *much*, English. It is remarkable that this last form is not found in A. S., being replaced by *sâre*, Germ. *sehr*. Grimm, iii. 608.

The Adverbial and the Norse forms indicate that the *l* is no part of the original word. Comparison with other Indo-European languages gives us the same circumstance: Sanskrit, *maha;* Lat. *mag-nus;* Gr. μέγας, (*megas*).

There is in M. G. the Comparative form *máiza*, and there is no objection to presuming a longer form, *magiza;* since in the Greek form μείζων, compared with μέγας, there is a similar disappearance of the *g*. In the O. H. G. we find *mêro*, corresponding with *máiza*, M. G., and with *more*, English.

Mickle (replaced by *great*) expresses size; *much*, quantity; *many*, number. The words *more* and *most* apply equally to number and quantity. I am not prepared either to assert or to deny that *many*, in A. S. *mœnig*, is from the same root with *much*. Of the word *mâ* notice has already been taken. Its later form, *moe*, occurs as late as Queen Elizabeth, with an Adjectival as well as an Adverbial sense.

Little, less.—Like *much* and *more*, these words are in an Etymological relation to each other. M. G. *leitils;* O. H. G. *luzil;* Old S. *luttil;* A. S. *lytel;* M. H. G. *lützel;* O. Norse, *lítill.* In these forms we have the letter *l*. O. H. G. Provincial, *luzîc;* Old Fr. *litich;* Middle Dutch, *luttik;* Sw. *liten;* Dan. *liden.*—D. G. iii. 611. From these we find that the *l* is either no part of the original word, or one that is easily got rid of. In Swedish and Danish there are the forms *lille* and *liden;* whilst in the Neuter form *lidt*, the *d* is unpronounced. Even the word *liden*, the Danes have a tendency to pronounce *leen*. My own notion is that these changes leave it possible for *less* to be derived from the root of *little*. According to Grimm, the A. S. *lässa*, is the Gothic *lasivôza*, the Comparative of *lasivs, weak.*—D. G. iii. 611. In A. S. there was the Adjectival form *læssa*, and the Adverbial form *læs*. In either case we have the form *s*.

Near, nearer.—A. S. *neah;* Comp. *nearre, near, nyr;* Superl. *nyhst, nehst.* Observe, in the A. S. Positive and Superlative, the absence of the *r*. This shows that the

English Positive *near* is the A. S. Comparative *nearre*, and that in the secondary Comparative *nearer* we have an excess of expression. It may be, however, that the *r* in *near* is a mere point of Orthography, and that it is not pronounced. The fact that in the English language the words *father* and *farther* are, for the most part, pronounced alike, is the key to the forms *near* and *nearer*.

Farther.—A. S. *feor*, *fyrre*, *fyrrest*. The *th* seems Euphonic, inserted by the same process that gives the δ in ἄνδρας.

Further.—Confounded with *farther*, although in reality from a different word, *fore*. O. H. G. *furdir;* N. H. G. *der vordere;* A. S. *fyrðre*.

Former.—A Comparative formed from the Superlative; *forma* being such. Consequently, an instance of excess of expression, combined with irregularity.

§ 159. That the Comparative Degree involves the idea of *one out of two*, has been stated at the end of Chapter VI; where it was also stated that the forms *other* and *whether* coincided with the sign of the Comparative Degree.

The Comparative termination *-er* occurs also elsewhere. How far the words wherein it appears are connected with those of the Comparative Degree, by means of the idea of *one out of two*, is a point of Metaphysics, which, here, there is not space to enter on.

1. In certain Prepositions, *under*, *over*, *super*, ὑπερ, both in English and other languages.

2. In the Latin words, *dexter*, right; *sinister*, left.

3. In *after*, *yonder*, *farther*, *further*, Adverbs or Prepositions. Here it is accompanied by *d*, which *d* may be either Euphonic, or the original *-t* in *tar*. The statement, under *farther*, that it was Euphonic, applied to that particular word only, and was grounded on its absence in

Anglo-Saxon. All these words we find in a simpler form; as *aft*, *yon*, *far*, *fore*.

4. In the forms in *r* of the Pronouns *we*, *ye*, *they*, as *our*, *your*, *their*. Observe, that it is only in the Plural Pronouns that the form in *r* occurs. In the Singular the corresponding form is *n*; *mine*, *thine*. Precisely the same occurs in Greek, where there is not only the *er*, but the *t* also, ἡμέτερος, ὑμέτερος, σφέτερος, νωίτερος, (*hæmeteros*, *hymeteros*, *sfeteros*, *nôiteros*,) as compared with ἕμος, σός, (*emos*, *sos*,) &c. &c. &c.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE SUPERLATIVE DEGREE.

§ 160. WHERE an Englishman says *grand, grander, grandest*, a Frenchman says *grand, more grand, the more grand*, or, what is the same thing, *grand, plus grand, le plus grand.* Compared with the English in respect to its Degrees, the French is in the same predicament that, in respect to Cases, the English is to the Latin. Whilst the Latin uses one word, *patri*, the Englishman uses a combination, *to a father.* Whilst the Englishman uses one word, *grander*, the Frenchman uses a combination, *plus grand.* The Englishman changes the form of the word. The Frenchman does no such thing. A change of form being considered essential to the idea of a Comparative or Superlative Degree, the French language has (with a few exceptions not bearing on the question) neither a Superlative nor a Comparative Degree. Some languages have a Comparative Degree, but no Superlative. *No language has a Superlative Degree without having also a Comparative one.* This last statement bears upon the Theory of the Superlative Degree.

§ 161. In M. G. *spêdists* means *last*, and *spêdiza, later.* Of the word *spêdists* two views may be taken. According to one it is the Positive Degree with the addition of *st;* according to others, it is the Comparative Degree with the addition only of *t.* Now Grimm, and others, lay down

as a rule, that the Superlative is formed, not directly from the Positive, but indirectly through the Comparative.

With the exception of *worse* and *less*, all the English Comparatives end in *r:* yet no Superlative ends in *rt*, the form being, not *wise, wiser, wisert*, but *wise, wiser, wisest.* This fact, without invalidating the notion just laid down, gives additional importance to the Comparative forms in *s;* since it is from these, before they have changed to *r*, that we must suppose the Superlatives to have been derived. The theory being admitted, we can, by approximation, determine the comparative antiquity of the Superlative Degree. It was introduced into the Indo-European tongues after the establishment of the Comparative, and before the change of *-s* into *-r.* I give no opinion as to the truth of this theory.

§ 162. The history of the Superlative Form, accurately parallel with what has been stated of the Comparative, is as follows:

In Sanskrit there is, 1. the form *tama*, 2. the form *ishta;* the first being the commonest. The same is the case in the Zend.

Each of these appears again in the Greek. The first, as τατ (*tat*), in λεπτότατος (*leptotatos*), the second, as ιστ (*ist*), in ὄικτιστος (*oiktistos*). For certain reasons, Grimm thinks that the *tat* stands for *tamt*, or *tant.*

In Latin, words like *intimus, extimus, ultimus*, preserve *tus;* whilst *venustus, vetustus*, and *robustus*, are considered as Positives, preserving the Superlative form *-st.*

Just as in *inferus* and *nuperus*, there was the ejection of the *t* in the Comparative *ter*, so in *infimus, nigerrimus*, &c. &c., is there the ejection of the same letter in the Superlative *tim.*

This gives us, as signs of the Superlative, 1. *tm;* 2. *st;* 3. *m, t* being lost; 4. *t, m* being lost.

Of the first and last of these, there are amongst the *true* Superlatives, in English, no specimens.

Of the third, there is a specimen in the A. S. *se forma, the first*, from the root *fore*, as compared with the Latin *primus*, and the Lithuanic *pirmas*.

The second, *st* (*wise, wisest*), is the current termination.

Of the English Superlatives, the only ones that demand a detailed examination are those that are generally despatched without difficulty; *viz.* the words in *most;* such as *midmost, foremost*, &c. &c. The current view is the one adopted by Rask in his A. S. Grammar (§ 133), *viz.* that they are compound words, formed from simple ones by the addition of the Superlative term *most*. Grimm's view is opposed to this. In appreciating Grimm's view, we must bear in mind the phenomena of *excess of expression;* at the same time we must not depart from the current theory without duly considering the fact stated by Rask; which is, that we have in Icelandic the forms *nærmeir, fjærmeir*, &c. &c. *nearer*, and *farther*, most unequivocally compounded of *near* and *more*, and of *far* and *more*.

Let especial notice be taken of the M. G. forms *fruma*, first; *aftuma*, last; and of the Anglo-Saxon forms *forma, aftema*, aftermost; *ufema*, upmost; *hindema*, hindmost; *midema*, midmost; *innema*, inmost; *útema*, outmost; *siðema*, last; *latema*, last; *niðema*, nethermost. These account for the *m*.

Add to this, with an excess of expression, the letters *st*. This accounts for the whole form, as *mid-m-ost, in-m-ost*, &c. &c. Such is Grimm's view.

Furthermost, innermost, hindermost.—Here there is a true addition of *most*, and an excess of Inflection, a Superlative form being added to a word in the Comparative degree.

Former.—Here, as stated before, a Comparative sign is added to a word in the Superlative Degree.

§ 163. The combination *st* occurs in other words besides those of the Superlative Degree; amongst others, in certain Adverbs and Prepositions, as *among, amongst; while, whilst; between, betwixt.*

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE ORDINAL NUMBERS.

§ 164. THE remarks at the close of the preceding Chapter indicated the fact that Superlative forms were found beyond the Superlative Degree. The present Chapter shows that they are certainly found in some, and possibly in all of the Ordinal Numbers.

First.—In M. G. *fruma*, *frumist;* in A. S. *forma*, *fyrmest;* in O. H. G. *vurist;* in O. N. *fyrst;* in N. H. G. *erst.* In all these words, whether in *m*, in *mst*, or in *st*, there is a Superlative form. The same is the case with *pratamas*, Sansk.; *fratemas*, Zend; πρῶτος, Gr.; *primus*, Lat.; *pirmas*, Lithuanic. Considering that, *compared with the other Ordinals*, the Ordinal of *one* is a sort of Superlative, this is not at all surprising.

Between the words *one* and *first*, there is no Etymological relation. This is the case in most languages. *Unus*, *primus*, εἷς, πρῶτος, &c. &c.

§ 165. *Second.*—Between this word and its Cardinal, *two*, there is no Etymological connexion. This is the case in many, if not in most, languages. In Latin the Cardinal is *duo*, and the Ordinal *secundus*, a Gerund of *sequor*, and meaning *the following.* In A. S. the form was *se oðer*, *the other.* In the present German, the Ordinal is *zweite*, a word etymologically connected with the Cardinal *zwei*, *two.*

M. G. *anþar;* O. H. G. *andar;* O. S. *othar;* O. Norse,

annar; O. Fr. *other;* Middle Dutch, *ander.* In all these words we have the Comparative form *ter;* and considering that, *compared with the word first,* the word *second* is a sort of Comparative, there is nothing in the circumstance to surprise us. The Greek forms δεύτερος and ἕτερος, the Latin *alter,* and the Lithuanic *antras,* are the same.

§ 166. With the third Ordinal Number begin difficulties. 1. In respect to their form. 2. In respect to the idea conveyed by them.

1. Comparing *third, fourth, fifth,* &c. &c. with *three, four,* and *five,* the formation of the Ordinal from the Cardinal form may seem simply to consist in the addition of *d* or *th.* Such, however, is far from being the case.

2. Arguing from the nature of the two first Ordinals, namely, the words *first* and *second,* of which one has been called a Superlative and the other a Comparative, it may seem a simple matter to associate, in regard to the rest, the idea of Ordinalism with the idea of Comparison. A plain distinction will show that the case of the two first Ordinals is peculiar. *First* is a Superlative, not as compared with its Cardinal, *one,* but as compared with the other Numerals. *Second,* or *other,* is a Comparative, not as compared with its Cardinal, *two,* but as compared with the Numeral *one.* Now it is very evident that, if the other Ordinals be either Comparatives or Superlatives, they must be so, not as compared with one another, but as compared with their respective Cardinals. *Sixth,* to be anything like a Superlative, must be so when compared with *Six.*

Now there are, in Etymology, two ways of determining the affinity of ideas. The first is the Metaphysical, the second the Empirical, method.

This is better than that is a sentence which the pure metaphysician may deal with. He may first determine that there is in it the idea of Comparison; and next, that

the Comparison is the comparison between *two* objects, and no more than two. This idea he may compare with others. He may determine that, with a sentence like *this is one and that is the other*, it has something in common; since both assert something concerning *one out of two objects*. Upon this connexion in sense he is at liberty to reason. He is at liberty to conceive that in certain languages words expressive of allied ideas may also be allied in form. Whether such be really the case, he leaves to Etymologists to decide.

The pure Etymologist proceeds differently. He assumes the connexion in meaning from the connexion in form. All that he at first observes is, that words like *other* and *better* have one and the same termination. For this identity he attempts to give a reason, and finds that he can best account for it by presuming some affinity in sense. Whether there be such an affinity he leaves to the Metaphysician to decide. This is the Empirical method.

At times the two methods coincide, and ideas evidently allied are expressed by forms evidently allied.

At times, the connexion between the ideas is evident, but the connexion between the forms obscure, and *vice versâ*. Oftener, however, the case is as it is with the subjects of the present Chapter. Are the ideas of Ordinalism in Number, and of Superlativeness in Degree allied? The Metaphysical view, taken by itself, gives us but unsatisfactory evidence, whilst the Empirical view, taken by itself, does the same. The two views, however, taken together, give us evidence of the kind called Cumulative, which is weak or strong according to its degree.

Compared with *three*, *four*, &c. &c., all the Ordinals are formed by the addition of *th* or *t;* and *th*, ð, *t*, or *d*, is the Ordinal sign, not only in English, but in the other Gothic languages. But, as stated before, this is not the whole of the question.

The letter *t* is found, with a similar power, 1. In Latin, as in *tertius*, *quartus*, *quintus*, *sextus*; 2. Greek, as in τρίτος (*tritos*), τέταρτος (*tetartos*), πέμπτος (*pemptos*), ἕκτος (*hectos*), ἔννατος (*ennatos*), δεκατος (*dekatos*); 3. Sanskrit, as in *tritíyas*, *'catur'tas*, *shasht'as*, 3rd, 4th, 6th; 4. In Zend, as in *thrityas*, *the third*; *haptathas*, *the seventh*; 5. In Lithuanic, as *ketwirtas*, 4th; *penktas*, 5th; *szesztas*, 6th; 6. In Old Slavonic, as in *cétvertyi*, 4th; *pjatyi*, 5th; *shestyi*, 6th; *devjatyi*, 9th; *desjatyi*, 10th. Speaking more generally, it is found, with a similar force, throughout the Indo-European stock.

The following forms indicate a fresh train of reasoning. The Greek ἕπτα (*hepta*), Icelandic *sjau*, may be compared with the Latin *septem* and the A. S. *seofon*. In the Greek and Icelandic there is the absence, in the Latin and A. S. the presence, of a final Liquid (*m* or *n*).

Again, the Greek form ἔννεα (*ennea*), and the Icelandic *níu* = *nine*, as compared with the Latin *novem* and the Gothic *nigun*, exhibit the same difference.

Thirdly; the Greek δἑκα (*deka*), and the Icelandic *tíu*, as compared with the Latin *decem* and the Gothic *tihun* = *ten*, do the same.

These three examples indicate the same circumstance; *viz.* that the *m* or *n*, in *seven*, *nine*, and *ten*, is no part of the original word.

§ 167. The following hypotheses account for these phenomena; *viz.* that the termination of the Ordinals is the Superlative termination *-tam*; that in some words, like the Latin *septimus*, the whole form is preserved; that in some, as in τέταρτος, *fourth*, the *t* only remains; and that in others, as in *decimus*, the *m* alone remains. Finally, that in *seven*, *nine*, and *ten*, the final Liquid, although now belonging to the Cardinal, was once the characteristic of the Ordinal Number. For a fuller exhibition of these views, see Grimm, D. G. iii. 640.

CHAPTER X.

THE ARTICLES.

§ 168. In the generality of Grammars the Definite Article *the*, and the Indefinite Article *an*, are the very first Parts of Speech that are considered. This is exceptionable. So far are they from being essential to language, that, in many dialects, they are wholly wanting. In Greek there is no Indefinite, in Latin there is neither an Indefinite nor a Definite Article. In the former language they say ἄνηϱ τις, *a certain man;* in the Latin the words *filius patris*, mean equally *the son of the father*, *a son of a father*, *a son of the father*, or *the son of a father*. In Mœso-Gothic, and in Old Norse, there is an equal absence of the Indefinite Article; or, at any rate, if there be one at all, it is a different word from what occurs in English. In these the Greek τις is expressed by the Gothic root *sum*.

Now as it is very evident that, as far as the sense is concerned, the words *some man*, *a certain man*, and *a man*, are, there or thereabouts, the same, an exception may be taken to the statement that in Greek and Mœso-Gothic there is no Indefinite Article. It may, in the present state of the argument, be fairly said that the words *sum*, and τις, are Pronouns with a certain sense, and that *a* and *an* are no more; consequently, that in Greek, the Indefinite Article is τις, in M. G. *sum*, and in English *a* or *an*.

A distinction, however, may be made. In the expression ἄνηϱ τις (*anær tis*), *a certain man*, or *a man*, and in the expression *sum mann*, the words *sum* and τις preserve their natural and original meaning; whilst in *a man*, and *an ox*, the words *a* and *an* are used in a secondary sense. These words, as is currently known, are one and the same, the *n*, in the form *a*, being ejected through a Euphonic Process. They are, moreover, the same word with the Numeral *one;* A. S. *án;* Scotch, *ane*. Now between the words *a man*, and *one man*, there is a difference in meaning; the first expression being the most Indefinite. Hence comes the difference between the English and the Mœso-Gothic expressions. In the one the word *sum* has a natural, in the other the word *an* has a secondary power.

The same reasoning applies to the word *the*. Compared with *a man*, the words *the man* are very Definite. Compared, however, with the words *that man*, they are the contrary. Now just as *an* and *a* have arisen out of the Numeral *one*, so has *the* arisen out of the Demonstrative Pronoun *þæt*, or at least from some root in common with it. It will be remembered that in A. S. there was a form *þe*, undeclined, and common to all the Cases of all the Numbers.

In no language in its oldest stage is there ever a word giving, in its primary sense, the ideas of *a* and *the*. As Tongues become modern, some Noun, with a *similar* sense, is used to express them. In the course of time a change of form takes place, corresponding to the change of meaning; *e. g. one* becomes *an*, and afterwards *a*. Then it is that Articles become looked upon as separate Parts of Speech, and are dealt with accordingly. No invalidation of this statement is drawn from the Greek language. Although the first page of the Etymology gives us ὁ, ἡ, το,

(*ho*, *hæ*, *to*,) as the Definite Articles, the corresponding page in the Syntax informs us that, in the oldest stage of the language, ὁ (*ho*), *the* had the power of ὅτος (*howtos*), *this*.

The origin of the Articles seems uniform. In German *ein*, in Danish *en*, stand to *one* in the same relation that *an* does. The French *un*, Italian and Spanish *uno*, are similarly related to *unus* = *one*.

And as, in English, þe, in German, *der*, in Danish, *den*, come from the Demonstrative Pronouns, so, in the Classical Languages, are the French *le*, the Italian *il* and *lo*, and the Spanish *el*, derived from the Latin Demonstrative, *ille*.

CHAPTER XI.

DIMINUTIVES, AUGMENTATIVES, AND PATRONYMICS.

§ 169. COMPARED with the words *lamb*, *man*, and *hill*, the words *lambkin*, *mannikin*, and *hillock*, convey the idea of comparative Smallness or Diminution. Now as the word *hillock* = *a little hill*, differs in form from *hill*, we have in English a series of Diminutive forms, or Diminutives.

The English Diminutives may be arranged according to a variety of principles. Amongst others:

1. *According to their form.*—The word *hillock* is derived from *hill*, by the addition of a syllable. The word *tip* is derived from *top* by the change of a Vowel.

2. *According to their meaning.*—In the word *hillock* there is the simple expression of comparative smallness in size. In the word *doggie*, for *dog*, *lassie*, for *lass*, the addition of the *-ie* makes the word not so much a Diminutive as a term of tenderness or endearment. The idea of smallness, accompanied, perhaps, with that of neatness, generally carries with it the idea of approbation. The word *clean* in English, means, in German, *little*, *kleine*. The feeling of protection which is extended to small objects engenders the notion of endearment. In Middle High German we have *vaterlîn*, *little father*; *müeterlîn*, *little mother*. The present German speaks of *die liebe sonne*, *the dear sun*. In M. H. G. there is the Diminutive *sunnelîn*; and the French *soleil* is from the Latin form *solillus*. In Slavonic the word

slunze (*sun*) is a Diminutive form. The Greek word μείωσις (*meiôsis*) means Diminution; the Greek word ὑποκόρισμα means an endearing expression. Hence we get names for the two kinds of Diminutives; *viz.* the term *meiotic* for the true Diminutives, and the term *hypocoristic* for the Diminutives of endearment. — Grimm, D. G. iii. 664.

3. *According to their historical origin.*—The syllable *-ock*, as in *hillock*, is of Anglo-Saxon and Gothic origin. The syllable *-et*, as in *lancet*, is of French and Classical origin.

4. *According as they affect Proper Names or Common Names.—Hawkin, Perkin, Wilkin*, &c. &c. In these words we have the Diminutives of *Hal, Peter, Will*, &c. &c. &c.

The Diminutive forms of Gothic origin are the first to be considered.

1. *Those formed by a change of Vowel.—Tip*, from *top*. The relation of the Feminine to the Masculine, is allied to the ideas conveyed by many Diminutives. Hence in the word *kit*, from *cat*, it is doubtful whether there be meant a female cat, or a little cat. *Kid* is a Diminutive form of *goat*.

2. *Those formed by the addition of a letter or letters.*— Of the Diminutive characteristics thus formed, the commonest, beginning from the simpler forms, are

Ie.—Almost peculiar to the Lowland Scotch; as *daddie, lassie, minnie, wifie, mousie, doggie, boatie*, &c. &c. D. G. iii. 686. *The County Paris*, in Romeo and Juliet, *the County Guy*, in Sir W. Scott's song in the Fortunes of Nigel, seem English instances of this form.

Ock.—Bullock, hillock.

Kin.—Lambkin, mannikin, ladikin, &c. &c. As is seen above common in Proper Names.

En.—Chicken, kitten, from *cock, cat*. The notion of

Diminution, if indeed that be the notion originally conveyed, lies not in the *-en*, but in the Vowel. In the word *chicken*, from *cock*, observe the effect of the small Vowel on the *c*. In the Chapter upon Derivation these words will again be alluded to.

The consideration of words like *duckling* and *gosling* is purposely deferred.

The chief Diminutive of Classical origin is:

Et, as in *trumpet*, *lancet*, *pocket*; the word *pock*, as in *meal-pock*, a *meal-bag*, being found in the Scottish. From the French *ette*, as in *caissette*, *poulette*.

The forms *-rel*, as in *cockerel*, *pickerel*, and *-let*, as in *streamlet*, require a separate consideration. The first has nothing to do with the Italian forms *acquerella* and *cosserella*; themselves, perhaps, of Gothic, rather than of Classical origin.

In the Old High-German there are a multitude of Diminutive forms in *l*; as *ouga*, an eye, *ougili*, a little eye, *lied*, a song, *liedel*, a little song. "In Austria and Ba-"varia are the forms *mannel*, *weibel*, *hundel*, &c. &c., or "*mannl*, *weibl*, *hundl*, &c. &c. In some districts there is "an *r* before the *l*, as *madarl*, a little maid, *muadarl*, a "little mother, *briadarl*, a little brother, &c. &c. This "is occasioned by the false analogy of the Diminutives "of the derived form in *r*."—D. G. iii. p. 674. This indicates the nature of words like *cockerel*.

In the words in point we must presume an earlier form, *cocker* and *piker*, to which the Diminutive form *-el* is affixed. If this be true, we have, in English, representatives of the Diminutive form *l*, so common in the High Germanic dialects. *Wolfer*, a wolf, *hunker*, a haunch, *flitcher*, a flitch, *teamer*, a team, *fresher*, a frog — these are North Country forms of the present English.*

* Guest, ii. 192.

The termination *-let*, as in *streamlet*, seems to be double, and to consist of the Gothic Diminutive *l*, and the French Diminutive *et*.

§ 170. *Augmentatives.*—Compared with *capello*, a hat, the Italian word *capellone*, a great hat, is an Augmentative. The Augmentative forms, pre-eminently common in the Italian language, often carry with them a depreciating sense.

The termination *-rd*, (in O. H. G. *-hart*,) as in *drunkard*, *braggart*, *laggard*, *stinkard*, carries with it this idea of depreciation. In *buzzard*, and *Reynard*, the name of the fox, it is simply Augmentative. In *wizard*, (see § 135,) from *witch*, it has the power of a Masculine form.

The termination *-rd*, taken from the Gothic, appears in the Modern languages of Classical origin, Fr. *vieillard*, Sp. *codardo*. From these we get at second-hand the word *coward*.—D. G. iii. 707.

The word *sweetheart* is, perhaps, a derived word of this sort, rather than a compound word; since in O. H. G. and M. H. G. we have the corresponding form *liebhart*. Now the form for *heart* is in German, not *hart*, but *herz*.

Words like *braggadocio*, *trombone*, *balloon*, being words of foreign origin, prove nothing as to the further existence of Augmentative forms in English.

§ 171. *Patronymics.*—In the Greek language the notion of lineal descent, in other words, the relation of the son to the father, is expressed by a particular termination; as Πηλεῦς (*Peleus*), Πηλείδης (*Peleidæs*), the son of Peleus. It is very evident that this mode of expression is very different from either the English form *Johnson*, or Gaelic *Mac Donald*. In these last-named words, the words *son* and *Mac* mean the same thing; so that *Johnson* and *M'Donald* are not derived, but compound words. This Greek way of expressing descent is peculiar, and the words

wherein it occurs are classed together by the peculiar name *Patronymic*, from *patær*, a father, and *onoma*, a name. Is there anything in English corresponding to the Greek Patronymics? It was for the sake of this question that the consideration of the termination *-ling*, as in *duckling*, &c. &c., was deferred.

The termination *-ling*, like the terminations *-rel* and *-let*, is compound. Its simpler form is *-ing*. This, from being affixed to the derived forms in *-l*, has become *-ling*.

In Anglo-Saxon the termination *-ing* is as truly Patronymic as *-ιδης* is in Greek. In the Bible-translation the son of Elisha is called *Elising*. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle occur such Genealogies as the following:—*Ida wæs Eopping, Eoppa Êsing, Êsa Inging, Inga Angenviting, Angenvit Alocing, Aloc Beonocing, Beonoc Branding, Brand Bældæging, Bældæg Vódening, Vóden Friðowulfing, Friðowulf Finning, Finn Godwulfing, Godwulf Geating.* = Ida was the son of Eoppa, Eoppa of Esing, Esing of Inga, Inga of Angenvit, Angenvit of Aloc, Aloc of Beonoc, Beonoc of Brand, Brand of Bældag, Bældag of Woden, Woden of Friðowulf, Friðowulf of Finn, Finn of Godwulf, Godwulf of Geat.—In Greek, Ἴδα ἦν Ἐοππέιδης, Ἔοππα Ἡσέιδης, Ἧσα Ἰγγέιδης, Ἴγγα Ἀγγενφιτέιδης, &c. &c. In the Plural Number these forms denote the *race of;* as *Scyldingas*, the Scyldings, or the race of *Scyld*, &c. &c. Edgar Atheling means Edgar of the race of the Nobles. The primary meaning of *-ing* and *-l-ing* is descent or relationship; from these comes the idea of youth and endearment, and thence the true Diminutive idea. In *darling*, *stripling*, *duckling*, *gosling* (Pr. *gesling*), *kitling* (Pr. for *kitten*), *nestling*, *yearling*, *chickling*, *fatling*, *fledgeling*, *firstling*, the idea of descent still remains. In *hireling* the idea of Diminution is accompanied with the idea of contempt. In *change-ling* we have a Gothic termina-

tion and a Classical root. See, for the full exposition of this view, D. G. ii. 349—364. iii. 682.

In the opening speech of Marlow's Jew of Malta we have the following lines:

> Here have I pursed their paltry *silverlings*.
> Fie! what a trouble 'tis to count this trash!
> Well fare the Arabs, that so richly pay
> For what they traffick in with wedge of gold.

The word *silverlings* has troubled the Commentators. *Burst their silverbins* has been proposed as the true reading. The word, however, is a true Diminutive, as *siluparline*, *silarbarling*, *a small silver coin*, O. H. G.

A good Chapter on the English Diminutives may be seen in the Cambridge Philological Museum, vol. i. p. 679.

CHAPTER XII.

ON VERBS IN GENERAL.

§ 172. Of Number, Person, Mood, Tense, and Conjugation, special notice is taken in their respective Chapters. On Verbs in general, in the way of Etymology, the English Grammarian can be brief. Of their divisions into Active and Passive, Transitive and Intransitive, unless there be an accompanying change of form, he takes no cognizance. The forces of the Auxiliary Verbs, and the Tenses to which they are equivalent, are points rather of Syntax than of Etymology.

All, in respect to Verbs in general, which the Etymologist has to determine, is whether they be Derived or Underived; and the division into Derived and Simple is the only one that he has to make.

Four classes of Derived Verbs more especially deserve our notice.

I. Those ending in *-en;* as *soften, whiten, strengthen,* &c. &c. Here it is necessary to remember that the *-en* is a derivational affix; lest it be mistaken for a representative of the A. S. Infinitive form *-an,* (as *lufian, bœrnan, to love, to burn,*) and the Old English *-en* (as *tellen, loven*).

II. Transitive Verbs derived from Intransitives by a change of the Vowel of the root.

Primitive Intransitive Form.	*Derived Transitive Form.*
Rise	Raise.
Lie	Lay.
Sit	Set.
Fall	Fell.
Drink	Drench.

In Anglo-Saxon these words were more numerous than they are at present. The following list is taken from the Cambridge Philological Museum, ii. 386. Here it may be observed that the Neuter Verb is given in the Præterite Tense, as it seems that upon that tense the Derived Active forms are founded.

Intrans. Infinitive.	*Intrans. Præterite.*	*Trans. Infinitive.*
Yrnan, *to run*	arn	ærnan, *to make to run.*
Byrnan, *to burn*	barn	bærnan, *to make to burn.*
Drincan, *to drink*	dranc	drencan, *to drench.*
Sincan, *to sink*	sanc	sencan, *to make to sink.*
Licgan, *to lie*	læ'g	lecgan, *to lay.*
Sittan, *to sit*	sæ't	settan, *to set.*
Drífan, *to drift*	dráf	dræfan, *to drive.*
Fëallan, *to fall*	fëoll	fyllan, *to fell.*
Wëallan, *to boil*	wëoll	wyllan, *to make to boil.*
Flëogan, *to fly*	flëáh	a-fligan, *to put to flight.*
Bëogan, *to bow*	bëáh	bígan, *to bend.*
Faran, *to go*	fór	feran, *to convey.*
Wacan, *to wake*	wóc	weccan, *to awaken.*

All these Intransitives form their Præterite by a change of Vowel, as *sink, sank;* all the Transitives by the addition of *d*, or *t*, as *fell, fell'd.*

III. Verbs derived from Nouns by a change of Accent; as *to survéy*, from a *súrvey.* For a fuller list see Chapter XXIV. Walker attributes the change of Accent to the influence of the participial termination *-ing.* All words thus affected are of foreign origin.

IV. Verbs formed from Nouns by changing a final Sharp Consonant into its corresponding Flat one; as,

The use	. . .	*to* use,	*pronounced* uze.
The breath	. . .	*to* breathe	— breadhe.
The cloth	. . .	*to* clothe	— clodhe.
The price	. . .	*to* prize	. . . .

CHAPTER XIII.

ON THE PERSONS.

§ 173. COMPARED with the Latin, the Greek, the Mœso-Gothic, and almost all the ancient languages, there is, in English, in respect to the Persons of the Verbs, but a very slight amount of Inflection. This may be seen by comparing the English word *call* with the Latin *voco*.

Sing.	*Plur.*	*Sing.*	*Plur.*
1. Voc-*o*.	Voc-*amus*.	Call.	Call.
2. Voc-as.	Voc-*atis*.	Call-est.	Call.
3. Voc-at.	Voc-*ant*.	*Call-eth.	Call.

Here the Latins have different forms for each different Person, whilst the English have forms for two only; and even, of these, one (*callest*) is becoming obsolete. With the forms of *voco* marked in Italics there is, in the current English, nothing correspondent. By reference to Chapter IV, Part I, we may compare the present English with the A. S. and with the Old English.

In the word *am*, as compared with *are* and *art*, we find a sign of the First Person Singular.

In the old forms *tellen*, *weren*, &c. &c. we have a sign of the three Persons of the Plural Number.

In the Modern English, the Old English, and the Anglo-Saxon, the peculiarities of our Personal Inflec-

* Or *call-s*.

tions are very great. This may be seen from the following tables of comparison:

Present Tense, Indicative Mood.

Mœso-Gothic.

	1*st Person.*	2*nd Person.*	3*rd Person.*
Singular.	Sôkja.	Sôkeis.	Sôkeiþ—*Seek.*
Plural.	Sôkjam.	Sôkeiþ.	Sôkjand.

Old High German.

Singular.	Prennu.	Prennîs.	Prennît—*Burn.*
Plural.	Prennames.	Prennat.	Prennant.

Icelandic.

Singular.	Kalla.	Kallar.	Kallar—*Call.*
Plural.	Köllum.	Kalliþ.	Kalla.

Old Saxon.

Singular.	Sôkju.	Sôkîs.	Sôkîd—*Seek.*
Plural.	Sôkjad.	Sôkjad.	Sôkjad.

Anglo-Saxon.

Singular.	Lufige.	Lufast.	Lufaƀ.
Plural.	Lufiaƀ.	Lufiaƀ.	Lufiaƀ.

Old English.

Singular.	Love.	Lovest.	Loveth.
Plural.	Loven.	Loven.	Loven.

Modern English.

Singular.	Love.	Lovest.	Loveth (or Loves).
Plural.	Love.	Love.	Love.

Herein remark; 1. the Anglo-Saxon addition of *t* in the Second Person Singular; 2. the identity in form of the three Persons of the Plural Number; 3. the change of *-aƀ* into *-en* in the Old English Plural; 4. the total absence of Plural forms in the Modern English; 5. the change of the *th* into *s*, in *loveth* and *loves*. These are points bearing

especially upon the history of the English Persons. The following points indicate a more general question.

1st. The full form *prennames* in the newer O. H. G., as compared with *sôkjam* in the *old* Mœso-Gothic.

2nd. The appearance of *r* in Icelandic.

3rd. The difference between the Old Saxon and the Anglo-Saxon in the Second Person Singular; the final *t* being absent in O. S.

4th. The respective power of M in the First, of S in the Second, and of T (or its allied sounds) in the Third Persons Singular; of MES in the First, of T (or its allied sounds) in the Second, and of ND in the Third Persons Plural. In this we have a regular expression of the Persons by means of regular signs; and this the history of the Personal Terminations verifies.

§ 174. *First Person—Singular.*—That the original sign of this Person was M we learn from the following forms; *dadâmi*, Sanskrit; *dadhâmi*, Zend; δίδωμι, Greek; *dûmi*, Lithuanic; *damy*, Slavonic = *I give*. The Latin Language preserves it in *sum* and *inquam*, and in the First Persons of Tenses, like *legam*, *legebam*, *legerem*, *legissem*. The form *im* = *I am* occurs in M. G.; and the words *stam* (*I stand*), *lirnem* (*I shall learn*), in O. H. G. The word *am* is a fragmentary specimen of it in our own language.

Plural.—The original sign MES. *Dadmas*, Sansk.; δίδομες, afterwards δίδομεν, Gr.; *damus*, Lat. = *we give*. The current form in O. H. G.

These forms in M may or may not be derived from the Pronoun of the First Person; *mâ*, Sansk.; *me*, Lat., English, &c. &c.

Second Person—Singular.—The original sign S. *Dadasi*, Sansk.; δίδως, Gr.; *das*, Lat.; *dasi*, Slavonic. Preserved in the Gothic Languages.

Plural.—The original sign T, or an allied sound. *Da-*

dyata, Sansk.; *daidhyâta*, Zend; δίδοτε, Gr.; *datis*, Lat.; *dûkite*, Lith.; *dashdite*, Slav. = *ye give*. Current in the Gothic Languages.

These forms in T and S may or may not be derived from the Pronoun of the Second Person; *tva*, Sansk.; σύ, Gr.; *thou*, Engl.

Third Person—Singular.—The original sign T. *Dadati*, Sansk.; *dadhâiti*, Zend; δίδωτι, Old Greek; *dat*, Lat.; *dûsti*, Lith.; *dasty*, Slav. = *he gives*. Preserved in the Gothic Languages.

Plural. — The original sign NT. *Dadenti*, Zend; δίδοντι, afterwards διδόασι, Gr.; *dant*, Lat. = *they give*. In M. G. and O. H. G.

The preceding examples are from Grimm and Bopp. To them add the Welsh form *carant* (*they love*), and the Persian *budend* (*they are*).

The forms in T and NT may or may not be derived from the Demonstrative Pronoun *ta*, S.; τό, Gr.; *that*, Engl.; &c. &c.

The present state of the Personal Inflection in English, so different from that of the Older Languages, has been brought about by two processes.

I. *Change of form.* — [a]) The ejection of *es* in *mes;* as in *sôkjam* and *köllum*, compared with *prennames;* [b]) the ejection of *m*, as in the First Person Singular, almost throughout; [c]) the change of *s* into *r*, as in the Norse *kallar*, compared with the Germanic *sôkeis;* [d]) the ejection of *d* from *nd*, as in *loven* (if this be the true explanation of that form) compared with *prennant;* [e]) the ejection of *nd*, as in *kalla;* [f]) the addition of *t*, as in *lufast* and *lovest*. In all these cases we have a change of form.

II. *Confusion or Extension.* — In vulgarisms like *I goes*, *I is*, one Person is used instead of another. In vulgarisms like *I are*, *we goes*, one Number is used instead of

another. In vulgarisms like *I be tired*, or *If I am tired*, one Mood is used instead of another. In vulgarisms like *I give*, for *I gave*, one Tense is used for another. In all this there is confusion. There is also extension; since, in the phrase *I is*, the Third Person is used instead of the First; in other words, it is used with an extension of its natural meaning. It has the power of the Third Person + that of the First. In the course of time one Person may entirely supplant, supersede, or replace another. The application of this is as follows:

The only Person of the Plural Number originally ending in ð is the Second; as *sôkeiþ*, *prennat*, *kalliþ*, *lufiað*; the original ending of the First Person being *mes*, or *m*, as *prennames*, *sôkjam*, *köllum*. Now, in A. S., the *First* Person ends in ð, as *lufiað*. Has *m*, or *mes*, changed to ð, or has the Second Person superseded the First? The latter alternative seems the likelier. The detail of the Persons seems to be as follows:

I call—First Person Singular.—The word *call* is not one Person more than another. It is the simple Verb, wholly uninflected. It is very probable that the First Person was the one where the characteristic termination was first lost. In the Modern Norse Language it is replaced by the Second. *Jeg taler*, *I speak*, D.

Thou callest—Second Person Singular.—The final *t* appears throughout the A. S., although wanting in O. S. In O. H. G. it begins to appear in Otfrid, and is general in Notker. In M. H. G. and N. H. G. it is universal.—D. G. i. 1041. 857.

He calleth, or *he calls*—Third Person Singular.—The *s* in *calls* is the *th* in *calleth*, changed. The Norse form *kallar* either derives its *r* from the *th* by way of change, or else the form is that of the Second Person replacing the First.

Lufiaδ, A. S.—First Person Plural.—The Second Person in the place of the First. The same in O. S.

Lufiaδ, A. S.—Third Person Plural.—Possibly changed from ND, as in *sôkjand*. More probably the Second Person.

Loven, Old English.—For all the Persons of the Plural. This form may be accounted for in three ways. 1. The *m* of the M. G. and H. O. G. became *n;* as it is in the Middle and Modern German, where all traces of the original *m* are lost. In this case the First Person has replaced the other two. 2. The *nd* may have become *n;* in which case it is the Third Person that replaces the others. 3. The Indicative form *loven* may have arisen out of a Subjunctive one; since there was in A. S. the form *lufion*, or *lufian*, Subjunctive. In the Modern Norse Languages the Third Person replaces the other two: *Vi tale, I tale, De tale* = *we talk, ye talk, they talk.*

§ 175. *The Person in* T. — *Art, wast, wert, shalt, wilt.* Here the Second Person Singular ends, not in *st*, but in *t*. A reason for this (though not wholly satisfactory) we find in the Mœso-Gothic and the Icelandic.

In those Languages the form of the Person changes with the Tense, and the Second Singular of the Præterite Tense of one Conjugation is, not *s*, but *t;* as M. G. *Svôr, I swore; svôrt, thou swarest; gráip, I griped; gráipt, thou griped'st;* Icelandic, *Brannt, thou burnest; gaft, thou gavest.* In the same languages ten Verbs are conjugated like Præterites. Of these, in each language, *skal* is one:

Mœso-Gothic.

Singular.	*Dual.*	*Plural.*
1. Skal.	Skulu.	Skulum.
2. Skalt.	Skuluts.	Skuluþ.
3. Skall.	Skuluts.	Skulun.

Icelandic.

Singular.	*Dual.*	*Plural.*
1. Skall.	. . .	Skulum.
2. Skalt.	. . .	Skuluð.
3. Skal.	. . .	Skulu.

§ 176. *Thou spakest, thou brakest, thou sungest.**—In these forms there is a slight though natural anomaly. They belong to the class of Verbs which form their Præterite by changing the Vowel of the Present; as *sing*, *sang*, &c. &c. Now all words of this sort in A. S. formed their Second Singular Præterite, not in *-st*, but in *-e*; as þú *funde, thou foundest;* þú *sunge, thou sungest.* The English termination is derived from the Present. Observe that this applies only to the Præterites formed by changing the Vowel. *Thou loved'st* is Anglo-Saxon as well as English, *viz.* þu *lufodest.*

* *Thou sangest, thou drankest,* &c.—For a reason given in § 184, *p.* 278, these forms are less unexceptionable than *sungest, drunkest,* &c.

CHAPTER XIV.

ON THE NUMBERS OF VERBS.

§ 177. THE Inflection of the Present Tense, not only in Anglo-Saxon, but in several other languages as well, has been given in the preceding Chapter. As compared with the Present Plural forms, *we love*, *ye love*, *they love*, both the Anglo-Saxon *we lufiaþ*, *ge lufiaþ*, *hi lufiaþ*, and the Old English *we loven*, *ye loven*, *they loven*, have a peculiar termination for the Plural Number which the present language wants. In other words, the Anglo-Saxon and the Old English have a Plural *Personal* characteristic, whilst the Modern English has nothing to correspond with it.

The word *Personal* is printed in italics. It does not follow that, because there is no Plural *Personal* characteristic, there is also no Plural characteristic.

There is no reason against the inflection of the word *love* running thus; *I love*, *thou lovest*, *he loves; we lave*, *ye lave*, *they lave;* in other words, there is no reason against the Vowel of the root being changed with the Number. In such a case there would be no *Personal* Inflection, though there would be a Plural, or a *Numeral*, Inflection.

Now, in Anglo-Saxon, with a great number of Verbs such a Plural Inflection not only actually takes place, but takes place most regularly. It takes place, however, in the Past Tense only. And this is the case in all the Gothic Languages as well as in Anglo-Saxon. Amongst the rest, in

Mœso-Gothic.

Skáin, *I shone;* Skinum, *we shone.*
Smáit, *I smote;* Smitum, *we smote.*
Káus, *I chose;* Kusum, *we chose.*
Láug, *I lied;* Lugum, *we lied.*
&c. &c. &c.

Gab, *I gave;* Gêbum, *we gave.*
At, *I ete;* êtum, *we ete.*
Stal, *I stole;* Stêlum, *we stole.*
Qvam, *I came;* Qvêmum, *we came.*
&c. &c. &c.

Anglo-Saxon.

Arn, *I ran;* Urnon, *we run.*
Ongan, *I began;* Ongunnon, *we begun.*
Span, *I span;* Spunnon, *we spun.*
Sang, *I sang;* Sungon, *we sung.*
Swang, *I swang;* Swungon, *we swung.*

Drane, *I drank;* Druncon, *we drunk.*
Sanc, *I sank;* Suncon, *we sunk.*
Sprang, *I sprang;* Sprungon, *we sprung.*
Swam, *I swam;* Swummon, *we swum.*
Rang, *I rang;* Rungon, *we rung.*

In all the A. S. words, it may be remarked that the change is from *a* to *u*, and that both the Vowels are short, or dependent. Also, that the Vowel of the Present Tense is *i* short; as *swim*, *sing*, &c. &c. The Anglo-Saxon form of *run* is *yrnan.*

In the following words the change is from the A. S. *á* to the A. S. *ī*. In English, the regularity of the change is obscured by a change of Pronunciation.

Bát, *I bit;* Biton, *we bit.* | Smát, *I smote;* Smiton, *we smit.*

From these examples the reader has himself drawn his inference; *viz.* that words like

Began, Begun.
Ran, Run.
Span, Spun.
Sang, Sung.
**Swang, Swung.*
Sprang, Sprung.

Sank, Sunk.
Swam, Swum.
Rang, Rung.
**Bat, Bit.*
Smote, Smit.
Drank, Drunk, &c. &c.

generally called double forms of the Past Tense, were originally different Numbers of the same Tense, the forms in *u*, as *swum*, and the forms in *i*, as *bit*, being Plural.

* Antiquated.

CHAPTER XV.

ON MOODS.

§ 178. In Anglo-Saxon there was a true Infinitive form ending in *-n;* as *lufian, to love, clypian, to call.* There is nothing of this sort in English. The *-en* in words like *strengthen,* &c. &c., is a Derivational Termination.

Between the Second Plural Imperative, and the Second Plural Indicative, *speak ye,* and *ye speak,* there is no difference of form. Between the Second Singular Imperative, *speak,* and the Second Singular Indicative, *speakest,* there is a difference in form. Still, as the Imperative form *speak* is distinguished from the Indicative form *speakest* by the negation of a character rather than by the possession of one, it cannot be said that there is in English any Imperative Mood.

If he speak, as opposed to *if he speaks,* is characterized by a negative sign only, and consequently is no true example of a Subjunctive. *Be,* as opposed to *am,* in the sentence *if it be so,* is an uninflected word used in a limited sense, and consequently no true example of a Subjunctive.

The only true Subjunctive Inflection in the English language is that of *were* and *wert,* as opposed to the Indicative forms *was* and *wast.*

Indicative.		*Subjunctive.*	
Singular.	*Plural.*	*Singular.*	*Plural.*
1. I was.	We were.	If I were.	If we were.
2. Thou wast.	Ye were.	If thou wert.	If ye were.
3. He was.	They were.	If he were.	If they were.

CHAPTER XVI.

ON TENSES IN GENERAL.

§ 179. THE nature of Tenses in general is best exhibited by reference to the Greek; since in that language they are more numerous, and more strongly marked than elsewhere.

I strike, I struck.—Of these words, the first implies an action taking place at the time of speaking, the second marks an action that has already taken place.

These two notions of Present and of Past time, being expressed by a change of form, are true Tenses. They are, however, the only true Tenses in our language. In *I was beating, I have beaten, I had beaten,* and *I shall beat,* a difference of time is expressed; but as it is expressed by a combination of words, and not by a change of form, no true Tenses are constituted.

In Greek the case is different. Τύπτω (*typtô*), *I beat;* ἔτυπτον (*etypton*), *I was beating;* τύψω (*typsô*), *I shall beat;* ἔτυψα (*etypsa*), *I beat;* τέτυφα (*tetyfa*), *I have beaten;* ἐτετύφειν (*etetyfein*), *I had beaten.* In these words we have, of the same Mood, the same Voice, and the same Conjugation, six different Tenses;* whereas, in English, there are but two. The forms τέτυφα and ἔτυψα are so strongly marked,

* As the present section is written with the single view of illustrating the subject, no mention has been made of the forms τυπῶ (*typô*), and ἔτυπον (*etypon*). Other reasons for not noticing these may be seen in § 210.

that we recognize them wheresoever they occur. The first is formed by a reduplication of the initial τ, and, consequently, may be called the Reduplicate form. As a Tense it is called the Perfect. In the form ἔτυψα an ε is prefixed, and an σ is added. In the allied language of Italy the ε disappears, whilst the σ (*s*) remains. Ἔτυψα is said to be an Aorist Tense. *Scripsi* : *scribo* : : ἔτυπσα : τύπτω.

§ 180. Now in the Latin language a confusion takes place between these two Tenses. Both forms exist. They are used, however, indiscriminately. The Aorist form has, besides its own, the sense of the Perfect. The Perfect has, besides its own, the sense of the Aorist. In the following pair of quotations, *vixi*, the Aorist form, is translated *I have lived*, while *tetigit*, the Perfect form, is translated *he touched*.

> *Vixi*, et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi ;
> Et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago.—Æn. iv.
>
> Ut primum alatis *tetigit* magalia plantis.—Æn. iv.

When a difference of form has ceased to express a difference of meaning, it has become superfluous. This is the case with the two forms in question. One of them may be dispensed with; and the consequence is, that, although in the Latin language both the Perfect and the Aorist forms are found, they are, with few exceptions, never found in the same word. Wherever there is the Perfect, the Aorist is wanting, and *vice versâ*. The two ideas of *I have struck*, and *I struck*, are merged into the notion of Past time in general, and are expressed by one of two forms, sometimes by that of the Greek Perfect, and sometimes by that of the Greek Aorist. On account of this the Grammarians have cut down the number of Latin Tenses to *five;* forms like *cucurri*, and *vixi*, being dealt with

as one and the same Tense. The true view is, that in *curro* the Aorist form is replaced by the Perfect, and in *vixi* the Perfect form is replaced by the Aorist.

§ 181. In the present English there is no Perfect or Reduplicate form. The form *moved* corresponds in meaning, not with τέτυφα and *momordi*, but ἔτυψα and *vixi*. Its sense is that of ἔτυψα, and not that of τέτυφα. The notion given by τέτυφα we express by the circumlocution *I have beaten*. We have no such forms as *bebeat*, or *memove*. In the Mœso-Gothic, however, there was a true Reduplicate form; in other words, a Perfect Tense as well as an Aorist. It is by the possession of this form that the Verbs of the six first Conjugations are characterized.

1st.	Falþa,	*I fold*	.	Fáifalþ,	*I have folded*, or *I folded*.
	Halda,	*I feed*	.	Háihald,	*I have fed*, or *I fed*.
	Haha,	*I hang*	.	Háihah,	*I have hanged*, or *I hanged*.
2nd.	Háita,	*I call*	.	Háiháit,	*I have called*, or *I called*.
	Láika,	*I play*	.	Láiláik,	*I have played*, or *I played*.
3rd.	Hláupa,	*I run*	.	Hláiláup,	*I have run*, or *I ran*.
4th.	Slêpa,	*I sleep*	.	Sáizlêp,	*I have slept*, or *I slept*.
5th.	Láia,	*I laugh*	.	Láilô,	*I have laughed*, or *I laught*.
	Sáija,	*I sow*	.	Sáisô,	*I have sown*, or *I sowed*.
6th.	Grêta,	*I weep*	.	Gáigrôt,	*I have wept*, or *I wept*.
	Têka,	*I touch*	.	Táitôk,	*I have touched*, or *I touched*.

In M. G., as in Latin, the Perfect forms have, besides their own, an Aorist sense, and *vice versâ*.

In M. G., as in Latin, few (if any) words are found in both forms.

In M. G., as in Latin, the two forms are dealt with as a single Tense; *láiló* being called the Præterite of *láia*, and *svôr* the Præterite of *svara*. The true view, however, is that in M. G., as in Latin, there are two Past Tenses, each having a certain latitude of meaning, and each, in certain words, replacing the other.

The Reduplicate form, in other words, the Perfect Tense, is current in none of the Gothic tongues except the M. G. A trace of it is found in the Anglo-Saxon of the seventh century in the word *hêht*, which is considered to be *hê-ht*, the Mœso-Gothic *háiháit*, *vocavi*. This statement is taken from the Cambridge Philological Museum, ii. 378.

§ 182. In the English language the Tense corresponding with the Greek Aorist and the Latin forms like *vixi*, is formed after two modes; 1, as in *fell*, *sang*, and *took*, from *fall*, *sing*, and *take*, by changing the vowel of the Present: 2, as in *moved* and *wept*, from *move* and *weep*, by the addition of *d* or *t;* the *d* or *t* not being found in the original word, but being a fresh element added to it. In forms, on the contrary, like *sang* and *fell*, no addition being made, no new element appears. The vowel, indeed, is changed, but nothing is added. Verbs, then, of the first sort, may be said to form their Præterites out of themselves; whilst Verbs of the second sort require something from without. To speak in a metaphor, words like *sang* and *fell* are comparatively Independent. Be this as it may, the German Grammarians call the Tenses formed by a change of vowel, the Strong Tenses, the Strong Verbs, the Strong Conjugation, or the Strong Order; and those formed by the addition of *d* or *t*, the Weak Tenses, the Weak Verbs, the Weak Conjugation, or the Weak Order. *Bound*, *spoke*, *gave*, *lay*, &c. &c. are Strong; *moved*, *favoured*, *instructed*, &c. &c. are Weak. For the proof that the Division of Verbs into Weak and Strong is a natural division, see the Chapter on Conjugation.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE STRONG TENSES.

§ 183. THE Strong Præterites are formed from the Present by changing the vowel, as *sing, sang, speak, spoke.*

§ 184. The first point in the history of these Tenses that the reader is required to be aware of, is stated in the Chapter upon the Numbers, *viz.* that, in A. S., several Præterites change, in their Plural, the vowel of their Singular; as,

Ic sang, *I sang.*	We sungon, *We sung.*
þu sunge, *Thou sungest.*	Ge sungon, *Ye sung.*
He sang, *He sang.*	Hi sungon, *They sung.*

As a general rule the Second Singular has the same vowel with the Plural Persons, as *burne, thou burntest,* Pl. *burnon, we burnt.*

The bearing of this fact upon the Præterites has been indicated in § 177. In a great number of words we have a double form, as *ran* and *run, sang* and *sung, drank* and *drunk,* &c. &c. &c. One of these forms is derived from the Singular, and the other from the Plural. I cannot say at what period the difference of form ceased to denote a difference of sense.

In cases where but one form is preserved, that form is not necessarily the Singular one. For instance, Ic fand,

I found, we fundon, *we found*, are the A. S. forms. Now the present word *found* comes, not from the Singular *fand*, but from the Plural *fund;* although in the Low-land Scotch dialect, and in the old writers, the Singular form occurs.

> Donald Caird finds orra tings,
> Where Allan Gregor *fand* the tings.—Scott.

Even in the present English it will be found convenient to call the forms like *sang* and *drank* the Singular, and those like *sung* and *bound* the Plural forms.

Be it observed that, though this fact accounts for most of our double forms, it will not account for all. A. S. Ic spræ'c, *I spake*, we spræ'con, *we spake*. Here there is no change of Number to account for the two forms *spake* and *spoke*.

First Class.

§ 185. Contains the two words *fall* and *fell*, *hold* and *held*, where the sound of *o* is changed into that of *ĕ*. Here must be noticed the natural tendency of *a* to become *o;* since the forms in A. S. are, *Ic fealle*, I fall; *Ic feoll*, I fell; *Ic healde*, I hold; *Ic heold*, I held.

Second Class.

§ 186. Here the Præterite ends in *-ew*. Words of this Class are distinguished from those of Class III. by the different form of the Present Tense.

Present.	*Præterite.*
Draw	Drew.
Slay	Slew.
Fly	Flew.

In these words the *w* has grown out of a *g*, as may be seen from the A. S. forms. The word *see* (*saw*) belongs to this Class; since, in A. S., we find the forms *geséah* and *gesegen*, and in the Swedish the Præterite form is *saag*.

Third Class.

§ 187. Here an *o* before *w*, in the Present, becomes *e* before *w* in the Præterite; as

Present.	*Præterite.*	*Present.*	*Præterite.*
Blow	Blew.	Know	Knew.
Crow	Crew.	Grow	Grew.
	Throw	Threw.	

Fourth Class.

§ 188. Contains the single word *let*, where a Short *e* in the Present remains unchanged in the Præterite. In the A. S. the Present form was *Ic læte*, the Præterite *Ic lét*.

Fifth Class.

§ 189. Contains the single word *beat*, where a Long *e* remains unchanged. In A. S. the forms were *Ic beáte*, *Ic beot*.

Sixth Class.

§ 190. Present *come*, Præterite *came*, Participle *come*. In A. S. *cume*, *com*, *cumen*.

Seventh Class.

§ 191. In this Class we have the sounds of the *ee*, in *feet*, and of the *a*, in *fate*, (spelt *ea* or *a*,) changed into *o* or *oo*. As several words in this class have a second form in *a*, the Præterite in *o* or *oo* will be called the Primary, the Præterite in *a* the Secondary form.

Present.	*Primary Præterite.*	*Secondary Præterite.*
Heave	*Hove	—
Cleave	Clove	*Clave.
Weave	Wove	—
Freeze	Froze	—
Steal	Stole	*Stale.
Speak	Spoke	Spake.
Swear	Swore	Sware.
Bear	Bore	Bare.
Tear	Tore	*Tare.
Shear	*Shore	—
Wear	Wore	*Ware.
Break	Broke	Brake.
Shake	Shook	—
Take	Took	—
Forsake	Forsook	—
Stand	Stood	—
—	Quoth	—
Get	Got	*Gat.

The Præterite of *stand* was originally long. This we collect from the spelling, and from the A. S. form *stód.* The process that ejects the *nd* is the same process that, in Greek, converts ὄδοντ-ος into ὀδ-ούς.

All the words with Secondary forms will appear again in Class VIII.

Eighth Class.

§ 192. In this Class the sound of the *ee* in *feet*, and the *a* in *fate*, (spelt *ea*,) is changed into *a*. Several words of this Class have Secondary forms. Further details may be seen in the remarks that come after the following list of Verbs.

Present.	*Primary Præterite.*	*Secondary Præterite.*
Speak	Spake	Spoke.
Break	Brake	Broke.
Cleave	*Clave	Clove.
Steal	*Stale	Stole.

* Obsolete.

Present.	*Primary Preterite.*	*Secondary Preterite.*
Eat	Ate	—
Seethe	—	*Sod.
Tread	*Trad	Trod.
Bear	Bare	Bore.
Tear	Tare	Tore.
Swear	Sware	Swore.
Wear	*Ware	Wore.
Bid	Bade	Bid.
Sit	Sate	—
Give	Gave	—
Lie	Lay	—
Get	*Gat	Got.

Here observe,—1. That in *speak*, *cleave*, *steal*, the *ea* has the same power with the *ee* in *freeze* and *seethe;* so that it may be dealt with as the long (or independent) sound of the *i* in *bid*, *sit*, *give*.

2. That the same view may be taken of the *ea* in *break*, although the word by some persons is pronounced *brake*. *Gabrika*, *gabrak*, M. G.; *briku*, *brak*, O. S.; *brece*, *brac*, A. S. Also of *bear*, *tear*, *swear*, *wear*. In the Provincial dialects these words are even now pronounced *beer*, *teer*, *sweer*. The forms in the allied languages are, in respect to these last-mentioned words, less confirmatory; M. G. *svara*, *báira;* O. H. G. *sverju*, *piru*.

3. That the *ea* in *tread* was originally long; A. S. *tredan*, *trede*, *træ'd*, *treden*.

4. *Lie.*—Here the sound is Diphthongal, having grown out of the A. S. forms *licgan*, *læ'g*, *legen*.

5. *Sat.* — The original Præterite was long. This we collect from the spelling *sate*, and from the A. S. *sæ't*.

Ninth Class.

§ 193. *A*, as in *fate*, is changed either into the *o* in *note*, or the *oo* in *book*. Here it should be noticed that, unlike

* Obsolete.

break and *swear*, &c. there is no tendency to sound the *a* of the Present as *ee*, neither is there, as was the case with *clove* and *spoke*, any tendency to Secondary forms in *a*. A partial reason for this lies in the original nature of the vowel. The original vowel in *speak* was *e*. If this was the *é fermé* of the French, it was a sound from which the *a* in *fate* and the *ee* in *feet* might equally have been evolved. The vowel sound of the Verbs of the present Class was that of *a* for the Present and that of *ó* for the Præterite forms; as *wace*, *wóc*, *grafe*, *gróf*. Now of these two sounds it may be said that the *a* has no tendency to become the *ee* in *feet*, and that the *ó* has no tendency to become the *a* in *fate*.

The sounds that are evolved from the accentuated *ó*, are the *o* in *note* and the *oo* in *book*.

Present.	*Præterite.*	*Present.*	*Præterite.*
Awake	awoke.	Take	took.
Wake	woke.	Shake	shook.
Lade	*lode.	Forsake	forsook.
Grave	*grove.	Shape	*shope.

Tenth Class.

§ 194. Containing the single word *strike*, *struck*, *stricken*. It is only in the M. H. G., the Middle Dutch, the New High German, the Modern Dutch, and the English, that this word is found in its Præterite forms. These are, in M. H. G., *streich;* N. H. G., *strich;* Middle Dutch, *strêc;* Modern Dutch, *strîk*. Originally it must have been referable to Class XI.

Eleventh Class.

§ 195. In this Class we first find the Secondary forms accounted for by the difference of form between the Singular and Plural Numbers. The change is from the *i* in *bite* to

* Obsolete.

the *o* in *note*, and the *i* in *pit*. Sometimes it is from the *i* in *bit* to the *a* in *bat*. The A. S. Conjugation (A) may be compared with the present English (B).

A.

Present.	*Præterite Sing.*	*Præterite Plur.*
Scine (*shine*),	Sceán (*I shone*),	Scinon (*we shone*).
Arise (*arise*),	Arás (*I arose*),	Arison (*we arose*).
Smite (*smite*),	Smát (*I smote*),	Smiton (*we smit*).

B.

Present.	*Præt.—Sing. form.*	*Præt.—Pl. form.*
Rise	Rose	*Ris.
Abide	Abode	—
Shine	Shone	—
Smite	Smote	Smit.
Ride	Rode	*Rid.
Stride	Strode	*Strid.
Slide	*Slode	Slid.
Glide	*Glode	—
Chide	*Chode	—
Drive	Drove	*Driv.
Thrive	Throve	*Thriv.
Strive	Strove	—
Write	Wrote	Writ.
Climb	Clomb	—
Slit	*Slat	Slit.
Bite	*Bat	Bit.

On this list we may make the following observations and statements.

1. That, with the exception of the word *slit*, the *i* is sounded as a Diphthong.

2. That, with the exception of *bat* and *slat*, it is changed into *o* in the Singular and into *ĭ* in the Plural forms.

3. That, with the exception of *shone*, the *o* is always Long (or Independent).

* The forms marked thus * are either obsolete or provincial.

4. That, even with the word *shone*, the *o* was originally Long. This is known from the final *e* mute, and from the Anglo-Saxon form *sceán;* M. G. *skáin;* Old Norse, *skein.*

5. That the *o*, in English, represents an *á* in A. S.

6. That the statement last made shows that even *bat* and *slat* were once in the same condition with *arose* and *smote;* the A. S. forms being *arás, smát, bát, slát.*

Twelfth Class.

§ 196. In this Class *i* is generally short; originally it was always so. In the Singular form it becomes *ă;* in the Plural, *ŭ.*

Present.	*Prœt.—Sing. form.*	*Prœt.—Pl. form.*
Swim	Swam	Swum.
Begin	Began	Begun.
Spin	*Span	Spun.
Win	*Wan	†Won.
Sing	Sang	Sung.
Swing	*Swang	Swung.
Spring	Sprang	Sprung.
Sting	*Stang	Stung.
Ring	Rang	Rung.
Wring	*Wrang	Wrung.
Fling	Flang	Flung.
Cling	—	Clung.
*Hing	Hang	Hung.
String	*Strang	Strung.
Sling	—	Slung.
Sink	Sank	Sunk.
Drink	*Drank	Drunk.
Shrink	Shrank	Shrunk.
Stink	*Stank	Stunk.
Swink	—	—
Slink	—	Slunk.
Swell	Swoll	—

* Obsolete. † Sounded *wun.*

Present.	*Prœt.—Sing. form.*	*Prœt.—Pl. form.*
Melt	*Molt	—
Help	*Holp	—
Delve	*Dolv	—
Dig	—	Dug.
Stick	*Stack	Stuck.
Run	Ran	Run.
Burst	—	Burst.
Bind	*Band	Bound.
Find	*Fand	Found.
Grind	—	Ground.
Wind	—	Wound.

Upon this list we make the following observations and statements.

1. That, with the exceptions of *bind*, *find*, *grind*, and *wind*, the vowels are short (or dependent) throughout.

2. That, with the exception of *run* and *burst*, the vowel of the Present Tense is either the *i* or *e*.

3. That *i* short changes into *a* for the Singular, and into *u* for the Plural forms.

4. That *e* changes into *o* in the Singular forms; these being the only ones preserved.

5. That the *i* in *bind*, &c. changes into *ou* in the Plural forms; the only ones current.

6. That the vowel before *m* or *n* is, with the single exception of *run*, always *i*.

7. That the vowel before *l* and *r* is, with the single exception of *burst*, always *e*.

8. That, where the *i* is sounded as in *bind*, the combination following is *-nd*.

9. That *ng* being considered as a modification of *k* (the Norse and Mœso-Gothic forms being *drecka* and *drikjan*), it may be stated that *i* short, in Class XII, precedes either a Liquid or a Mute of series *k*.

From these observations, even on the English forms

* Obsolete.

only, we find thus much regularity; and from these observations, even on the English forms only, we may lay down a rule like the following; *viz.* that *i* or *u*, short, before the consonants *m*, *n*, or *ck*, is changed into *a* for the Singular, and into *u* for the Plural forms; that *i* long, or diphthongal, becomes *ou;* that *e* before *l* becomes *o;* and that *u* before *r* remains unchanged.

This statement, however, is nothing like so general as the one that, after a comparison of the older forms and the allied languages, we are enabled to make. Here we are taught,

1. That, in the words *bind*, &c. &c. the *i* was once pronounced as in *till*, *fill;* in other words, that it was the simple short vowel, and not the diphthong *ey;* or at least that it was treated as such.

Mœso-Gothic.

Binda	band	bundum	bundans.
Bivinda	bivand	bivundum	bivunduns.
Finþa	fanþ	funþum	funþans.

Anglo-Saxon.

Binde	band	bundon	bunden.
Finde	fand	fundon	funden.
Grinde	grand	grundon	grunden.
Winde	wand	windon	wunden.

Old Norse.

Finn	fann	funðum	funninn.
Bind	batt	bundum	bundinn.
Vind	vatt	undum	undinn.

When the vowel ĭ of the Present took the sound of the *i* in *bite*, the ŭ in the Præterite became the *ou* in *mouse.* From this we see that the words *bind*, &c. &c. are naturally subject to the same changes with *spin*, &c. &c., and that, *mutatis mutandis*, they are so still.

2. That the *e* in *swell*, &c. &c. was once *i*. This we collect from the following forms; *hilpa*, M. G.; *hilfu*, O. H. G.; *hilpu*, O. S.; *hilpe*, M. H. G.; *hilpe*, Old Fr.—*Suillu* (*swell*), O. H. G.—*Tilfu* (*delve*), O. H. G.; *dilbu*, O. S.—*Smilzu*, O. H. G. (*smelt* or *melt*). This shows that originally the vowel *i* ran throughout, but that before *l* and *r* it was changed into *e*. This change took place at different periods in different dialects. The Old Saxon preserved the *i* longer than the A. S. It is found even in the *Middle* High German; in the *New* it has become *e;* as, *schwelle*, *schmelze*. In one word, *milk*, the original *i* is still preserved; although in A. S. it was *e;* as *melce*, *mealc* (*milked*), **mulcon*. In the Norse the change from *i* to *e* took place full soon, as *svëll* = *swells*. The Norse language is in this respect important.

3. That the *o* in *swoll*, *holp*, was originally *a;* as

Hilpa	haip	hulpum . .	M. G.
Suillu	sual	suullumês .	O. H. G.
Hilfu	half	hulfumês . .	*do.*
Tilfu	talf	tulfumês .	*do.*
Hilpe	halp	hulpun . .	M. H. G.
Dilbe	dalp	dulbun .	*do.*
Hilpe	halp	hulpon . .	*do.*
Svëll	svall	sullum .	*Old Norse.*
Melte	mealt	multon . .	A. S.
Helpe	healp	hulpon .	*do.*
Delfe	dealf	dulfon . .	*do.*

4. That a change between *a* and *o* took place by times. The A. S. Præterite of *swelle* is *sweoll;* whilst *ongon*, *bond*, *song*, *gelomp*, are found in the same language for *ongan*, *band*, *sang*, *gelamp*.—Rask's A. S. Grammar, p. 90.

5. That *run* is only an apparent exception, the older form being *rinn*.

> The rain *rinns* down through Merriland town;
> So doth it down the Pa.—*Old Ballad.*

The A. S. form is *yrnan;* in the Præterite *arn, urnon.* A transposition has since taken place. The word *run* seems to have been originally no Present, but a Præterite form.

6. That *burst* is only an apparent exception. Before *r*, *ĕ, ĭ, ŭ*, are pronounced alike. We draw no distinction between the vowels in *pert, flirt, hurt.* The Anglo-Saxon forms are *berste, byrst, bærst, burston, borsten.*

Thirteenth Class.

§ 197. Contains the single word *choose*, in the Præterite *chose;* in A. S. *ceóse, ceás.*

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE WEAK TENSES.

§ 198. THE Præterite Tense of the Weak Verbs is formed by the addition of *d* or *t*. If necessary, the syllable *-ed* is substituted for *d*.

The current statement that the syllable *-ed*, rather than the letter *-d*, is the sign of the Præterite Tense, is true only in regard to the written language. In *stabbed*, *moved*, *bragged*, *whizzed*, *judged*, *filled*, *slurred*, *slammed*, *shunned*, *barred*, *strewed*, the *e* is a point of spelling only. In *language*, except in declamation, there is no second vowel sound. The *d* comes in immediate contact with the final letter of the original word, and the number of syllables remains the same as it was before.

When, however, the original word ends in *d* or *t*, as *slight* or *brand*, then, and then only (and that not always), is there the addition of the syllable *-ed;* as in *slighted*, *branded*. This is necessary, since the combinations *slightt* and *brandd* are unpronounceable.

Whether the addition be *d* or *t* depends upon the Flatness or Sharpness of the preceding letter.

After *b*, *v*, *th* (as in *clothe*), *g*, or *z*, the addition is *d*. This is a matter of necessity. We say *stabd*, *móvd*, *clóthd*, *braggd*, *whizzd*, because *stapd*, *móvt*, *clótht*, *braggt*, *whizzt*, are unpronounceable.

After *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *w*, *y*, or a vowel, the addition is also *d*.

This is the *habit* of the English Language. *Filt*, *slurt*, *slamt*, *shunt*, *hart*, *chewt*, *strayt*, &c. &c. are as pronounceable as *filld*, *slurrd*, *slammd*, *strayd*, &c. &c. It is the habit, however, of the English Language to prefer the latter forms. All this, as the reader has probably observed, is merely the reasoning concerning the *-s*, in words like *father's*, &c. &c. applied to another letter and to another part of speech.

For some historical notices respecting the use of *d*, *t*, and *-ed*, in the spelling of the English Præterites and Participles, the reader is referred to the Cambridge Philological Museum, Vol. i. p. 655.

§ 199. The Verbs of the Weak Conjugation fall into Three Classes. In the first there is the simple addition of *d*, *t*, or *-ed*.

Serve, served.	Dip, dipt.
Cry, cried.	Slip, slipt.
Betray, betrayed.	Step, stepped (*stept*).
Expell, expelled.	Look, looked (*lookt*).
Accuse, accused.	Pluck, plucked (*pluckt*).
Instruct, instructed.	Toss, tossed (*tost*).
Invite, invited.	Push, pushed (*pusht*).
Waste, wasted.	Confess, confessed (*confest*).

To this Class belong the greater part of the Weak Verbs, and all Verbs of foreign origin.

§ 200. In the Second Class, besides the addition of *t* or *d*, the vowel is *shortened*. It also contains those words which end in *-d* or *-t*, and at the same time have a short vowel in the Præterite. Such, amongst others, are *cut*, *cost*, &c. &c. where the two tenses are alike, and *bend*, *rend*, &c. &c. where the Præterite is formed from the Present by changing *d* into *t*, as *bent*, *rent*, &c. &c. The reason of this will be seen in § 202.

In the following list, the words ending in *p* are remark-

able; since, in A. S., each of them had, instead of a Weak, a Strong Præterite.

Leave, left.	Creep, crept.
Cleave, cleft.	Sleep, slept.
Bereave, bereft.	Leap, leapt.
Deal, deăl*t*.	Keep, kept.
Feel, fel*t*.	Weep, wept.
Dream, dreăm*t*.	Sweep, swept.
Lean, leán*t*.	Lose, lost.
Learn, learn*t*.	Flee, fled.

In this Class we sometimes find *t* where the *d* is expected; the forms being *left* and *dealt*, instead of *leaved* and *dealed*.

§ 201. *Third Class.*—In the Second Class the vowel of the Present Tense was *shortened* in the Præterite. In Class III. it is *changed*.

Tell, told.	Sell, sold.
Will, would.	Shall, should.

To this Class belong the remarkable Præterites of the Verbs *seek*, *beseech*, *catch*, *teach*, *bring*, *think*, and *buy*, *viz.* *sought*, *besought*, *caught*, *taught*, *brought*, *thought*, and *bought*. In all these the final Consonant is either *g*, *k*, or a sound allied to those mutes. When the tendency of these sounds to become *h* and *y*, as well as to undergo farther changes, is remembered, the forms in point cease to seem anomalous. In *wrought*, from *work*, there is a transposition as well. In *laid* and *said* the Present forms make a show of regularity which they have not. The A. S. forms are *lede* and *sæde*, from *legde* and *sægde*, the Infinitives being *leegan*, *sægan*. In these words the *i* represents the semivowel *y*, into which the original *g* was changed. The A. S. forms of the other words are as follows:

Bycgan, bóhte.	Bringan, bróhte.
Sécan, sóhte.	þencan, þóhte.

Wyrcan, wórhte.

§ 202. Out of the three Classes into which the Weak Verbs in Anglo-Saxon are divided, only one takes a vowel before the *d* or *t*. The other two add the syllables *te*, or *de*, to the last letter of the original word. The vowel that, in one out of the three Anglo-Saxon Classes, precedes *d* is *o*. Thus we have *lufian*, *lufode; clypian*, *clypode*. In the other two Classes the forms are respectively *bærnan*, *bærnde*, and *tellan*, *tealde*, no vowel being found. The Participle, however, as stated above, ended, not in *de* or *te*, but in *d* or *t;* and in two out of the three Classes it was preceded by a vowel, *gelufod*, *bærned*, *getealde*. Now in those Conjugations where no vowel preceded the *d* of the Præterite, and where the original word ended in *d* or *t*, a difficulty, which has already been indicated, arose. To add the sign of the Præterite to a word like *eard ian* (*to dwell*) was an easy matter, inasmuch as *eardian* was a word belonging to Class I, and in Class I. the Præterite was formed in *-ode*. Here the vowel *o* kept the two *d*'s from coming in contact. With words, however, like *métan* and *sendan*, this was not the case. Here no vowel intervened; so that the natural Præterite forms were *met-te*, *send-de*, combinations wherein one of the letters ran every chance of being dropped in the pronunciation. Hence, with the exception of the Verbs in Class I, words ending in *-d* or *-t* in the root admitted no additional *d* or *t* in the Præterite. This difficulty, existing in the present English as it existed in the Anglo-Saxon, modifies the Præterites of most words ending in *t* or *d*.

In several words there is the actual addition of the syllable *-ed;* in other words *d* is separated from the last

letter of the original word by the addition of a vowel; as *ended*, *instructed*, &c. &c. Of this *e* two views may be taken.

1. It may be derived from the original *o* in *-ode*, the termination of the First Class in A. S. This is the opinion which we form when the word in question is known to have belonged to the Anglo-Saxon language, and, in it, to Class I. *Ended*, *planted*, *warded*, *hated*, *heeded*, are (amongst others) words of this sort; their A. S. forms being *endode*, *plantode*, *weardode*, *hatode*, and *eahtode*, from *endian*, *plantian*, *weardian*, *hatian*, and *eahtian*.

2. The form may be looked upon, not as that of the Præterite, but as that of the Participle in a transferred sense. This is the view when we have two forms, one with the vowel, and the other without it, as *bended* and *bent*, *wended* and *went*, *plighted* and *plight*.

In several words the final *d* is changed into *t*, as *bend*, *bent*; *rend*, *rent*; *send*, *sent*; *gild*, *gilt*; *build*, *built*; *spend*, *spent*, &c. &c.

In several words the vowel of the root is changed; as *feed*, *fed*; *bleed*, *bled*; *breed*, *bred*; *meet*, *met*; *speed*, *sped*; *rēad*, *rĕad*, &c. &c. Words of this last-named Class cause occasional difficulty to the Grammarian. No addition is made to the root, and, in this circumstance, they agree with the Strong Verbs. Moreover there is a change of the vowel. In this circumstance also they agree with the Strong Verbs. Hence with forms like *fed* and *led* we are in doubt as to the Conjugation. This doubt we have three means of settling.

1. *By the form of the Participle.*—The *-en* in *beaten* shows that the word *beat* is Strong.

2. *By the nature of the Vowel.*—The Weak form of *to beat* would be *bet*, or *beăt*, after the analogy of *feed* and

rēad. By some persons the word is pronounced *bet*, and with those who do so the word is Weak.

3. *By a knowledge of the Older forms.*—The A. S. form is *beáte*, *beot*. There is no such a Weak form as *beáte*, *bætte*. The Præterite of *sendan* is *sende*, Weak. There is in A. S. no such form as *sand*, Strong.

In all this we see a series of expedients for separating the Præterite form from the Present, when the root ends with the same sound with which the affix begins.

The addition of the vowel takes place only in Verbs of Class I.

The change from a Long Vowel to a Short one, as in *feed*, *fed*, &c., can only take place where there is a Long Vowel to be changed.

Where the vowels are Short, and, at the same time, the word ends in *d*, the *d* of the Present may become *t* in the Præterite. Such is the case with *bend*, *bent*.

Where there is no Long Vowel to shorten, and no *d* to change into *t*, the two Tenses, of necessity, remain alike; such is the case with *cut*, *cost*, &c. &c.

Words like *planted*, *heeded*, &c. belong to Class I. Words like *feed*, *lead*, to Class II. *Bend* and *cut* belong also to the Second Class; they belong to it, however, by what may be called an Etymological fiction. The vowel would be changed if it could.

§ 203. *Made*, *had.*—In these words there is nothing remarkable but the ejection of a consonant. The A. S. forms are *macode* and *hæfde*, respectively. The words, however, in regard to the amount of change are not upon a *par*. The *f* in *hæfde* was probably sounded as *v*. Now *v* is a letter excessively liable to be ejected, which *k* is not. *K*, before it is ejected, is generally changed into either *g* or *y*.

Would, *should.*—It must not be imagined that *could* is in

the same predicament with these words. In *will* and *shall* the *-l* is part of the original word. This is not the case with *can*. For the form *could*, see the Chapter upon Irregularity.

Aught.—In A. S. *áhte*, the Præterite of the Present form *áh*, Plural *ágon*. As late as the time of Elizabeth we find *owe* used for *own*. The Present form *own* seems to have arisen from the Plural *ágon*. *Aught* is the Præterite of the A. S. *áh; owed* of the English *owe* = *debeo; owned* of the English *own* = *possideo*. The word *own*, in the expression *to own to a thing*, has a totally different origin. It comes from the A. S. *an* (Plural, *unnon*,) *I give*, or *grant* = *concedo*.

Durst.—The Verb *dare* is both Transitive and Intransitive. We can say either *I dare do such a thing*, or *I dare* (*challenge*) *such a man to do it*. This, in the Present Tense, is unequivocally correct. In the Past the double power of the word *dare* is ambiguous; still it is, to my mind at least, allowable. We can certainly say *I dared him to accept my challenge*; and we can, perhaps, say *I dared venture on the expedition*. In this last sentence, however, *durst* is the preferable expression.

Now, although *dare* is both Transitive and Intransitive, *durst* is only Intransitive. It never agrees with the Latin word *provoco*; only with the Latin word *audeo*. Moreover, the word *durst* has both a Present and a Past sense. The difficulty which it presents consists in the presence of the *-s*, a letter characteristic of the Second Person Singular, but here found in all the Persons alike; as *I durst*, *they durst*, &c. &c.

The M. G. forms are *dar*, *dart? dar*, *daúrum*, *daúruþ*, *daúrun*, for the Persons of the Present Tense; and *daúrsta*, *daúrstés*, *daúrsta*, &c. &c. for those of the Præterite. The same is the case throughout the Germanic Languages.

No *-s*, however, appears in Scandinavian; the Præterites being *þorði* and *törde*, Icel. and Dan. The A. S. is *dear, I dare; dearst, thou darest; durron, we, ye,* or *they dare:* Subjunct. *durre, dorste, dorston.* O. S. Pres. *dar*; Præt. *dursta.* The Mœso-Gothic Tense *daúrsta*, instead of *daúrda*, shows the antiquity of this form in *-s*.

The readiest mode of accounting for the form in question is to suppose that the Second Singular has been extended over all the other Persons (see *p.* 267). This view, however, is traversed by the absence of the *-s* in the Mœso-Gothic Present. The form there (real or presumed) is not *darst*, but *dart.* Of this latter form, however, it must be remarked that its existence is hypothetical.

In Matthew, xxvi. 67, of the Mœso-Gothic Gospel of Ulphilas, is found the form *kaúpastêdun*, instead of *kaúpatidêdun*, the Præterite Plural of *kaúpatjan, to beat.* Here there is a similar insertion of the *-s*.— D. G. i. 848, 852, 853.

The *-s* in *durst* has still to be satisfactorily accounted for.

Must.—A form common to all Persons, Numbers, and Tenses. That neither the *-s* nor the *-t* are part of the original root, is indicated by the Scandinavian form *maae* (D.), pronounced *moh;* Præterite, *maatte.*

The readiest mode of accounting for the *-s* in *most*, is to presume that it belongs to the Second Singular, extended to the other Persons, *mo-est, must.* Irrespective, however, of other objections, this view is traversed by the forms *môtan*, M. G. (an Infinitive), and *mót*, M. G., O. S., and A. S. (a First Person Present). These neutralize the evidence given by the Danish form *maae*, and indicate that the *-t* is truly a part of the original root.

Now, the *-t* being considered as part of the root, the *-s* cannot be derived from the Second Singular; inasmuch as it precedes, instead of following, the *-t.*

At one time, for want of a better theory, I conceived that, in the word in point, (and also in *durst* and a few others,) we had traces of the Scandinavian Passive: see p. 13. This notion I have, for evident reasons, abandoned.

In p. 269 it was stated that the Mœso-Gothic termination of the Second Singular of the Strong Præterites was *-t*. It is here mentioned that *must* is a Præterite form. Now the final letter of the root *mot*, and the sign of the Second Singular of the Strong Præterite, are the same, *-t*. Now, as *t* cannot be immediately added to *t*, the natural form of the Second Singular *môt-t* is impracticable. Hence, before the *-t* of the Second Person, the *-t* of the root is changed, so that, instead of *máimáit-t*, *bigat-t*, *fáifalþt*, *láilot-t*, &c. &c., we have *máimáis-t*, *bigas-t*, *fáifals-t*, *láilos-t*, &c. &c., M. G.—See D. G. 844.

The Euphonic reason for the *-s*, in *must*, is sufficient to show that it is in a different predicament from *durst*.

The Provincial form *mun*, there or thereabouts equivalent in meaning to *must*, has no Etymological connexion with this last-named word. It is a distinct word, in Scandinavian *monne*.

Wist.—In its present form a regular Præterite from *wiss* = *know*. The difficulties of this word arise from the parallel forms *wit* (as in *to wit*), and *wot* (*knew*). The following are the forms of this peculiar word.

In Mœso-Gothic, 1st Sing. Pres. Ind. *váit;* 2nd *do.*, *váist;* 1st Pl. *vitum;* Præterite 1st S. *vissa;* 2nd, *vissés;* 1st Pl. *vissédum*. From the form *váist* we see that the Second Singular is formed after the manner of *must;* that is, *váist* stands instead of *váit-t*. From the form *vissédum* we see that the Præterite is not Strong, but Weak; therefore that *vissa* is Euphonic for *vista*.

In A. S.—*Wât*, *wâst*, *witon*, *wiste* and *wisse*, *wiston*. Here the double forms, *wiste* and *wisse*, verify the statement concerning the M. G. *vissa*.

In Icelandic.—*Veit, veizt, vitum, vissi.* Danish *ved, vide, vidste.* Observe the form *vidste;* since, in it, the *-d* of the root (in spelling at least) is preserved. The *-t* of the A. S. *wiste* is the *-t*, not of the root, but of the Inflection.

In respect to the four forms in question, viz. *wit, wot, wiss, wist;* the first seems to be the root; the second a Strong Præterite regularly formed, but used (like οἶδα in Greek) with a Present sense; the third a weak Præterite, of which the *-t* has been ejected by a Euphonic process, used also with a Present sense; the fourth is either a Second Singular from *wiss* after the manner of *wert* from *were*, a Second Singular from *wit* after the manner of *must*, a secondary Præterite from *wiss*, or finally, the form *wisse*, anterior to the operation of the Euphonic process that ejected the *-t*.

Do.—In the phrase *this will do = this will answer the purpose*, the word *do* is wholly different from the word *do*, meaning *to act.* In the first case it is equivalent to the Latin *valere;* in the second to the Latin *facere.* Of the first the A. S. Inflection is *deáh, dugon, dohte, dohtest*, &c. &c. Of the second it is *dó, dóð, dyde*, &c. &c. I doubt whether the Præterite *did*, as equivalent to *valebat* (*was good for*), is correct. In the phrase *it did for him = it finished him*, either meaning may be allowed.

In the present Danish they write *duger*, but say *duer;* as *duger det noget? = Is it worth anything?* pronounced *Dooer deh note?* This accounts for the ejection of the *g*. The A. S. form *deáh* does the same.

In respect to the Præterite of *do=facio*, difficulties present themselves.

Is the word Weak?—This is the view that arises from the form *did.* The participle *done* traverses this view. See also § 204.

Is the word Strong?—In favour of this notion we have

the English Participle *done*, and the Præterite Second Singular in O. H. G. *tâti*. Against it are the O. S. *dëdôs*, and the A. S. *dydest*, as Second Singulars.

Is there a Reduplication?—If this were the case, we might assume such a form as *dôan*, *dáidô*, for the M. G. This view, however, is traversed by the Substantival forms *dêds*, M. G.; *tât*, O. H. G.; *dæd*, A. S.; which show that the second *d* is part of the original word.

The true nature of the form *did* has yet to be exhibited. See D. G. i. 1041.

Mind—Mind and do so and so.—In this sentence the word *mind* is wholly different from the Noun *mind*. The A. S. forms are *geman*, *gemanst*, *gemunon*, without the *-d;* this letter occurring only in the Præterite Tense (*gemunde*, *gemundon*), of which it is the sign. *Mind* is, then, a Præterite form with a Present sense; whilst *minded* (as in *he minded his business*) is an instance of excess of Inflection; in other words, it is a Præterite formed from a Præterite.

A Præterite formed upon a Præterite may also be called a Secondary Præterite; just as, in *p.* 228, the word *theirs*, derived from *their*, (a Case formed from a Case,) was called a Secondary Genitive.

In like manner the Present form *mind* is not a genuine Present, but a Præterite with a Present sense; *its form being taken as the test.* Presents of this sort may be called Transformed Præterites.

It is very evident that the Præterites most likely to become Present are those of the Strong Class. In the first place, the fact of their being Præterite is less marked. The word *fell* carries with it fewer marks of its Tense than the word *moved.* In the second place, they can more conveniently give rise to Secondary Præterites. A Weak Præterite already ends in *-d* or *-t*. If this be used as a Present, a second *-d* or *-t* must be appended.

Hence it is that all the Transposed Præterites in the Gothic tongues were, before they took the Present sense, not Weak, but Strong. The word in question, *mind*, (from whence *minded*,) is only an apparent exception to this statement.

Now the words *shall*, *can*, *owe* (whence *aught*), *dare*, *may*, *man* (of the A. S. *geman*, the origin of *mind*), are, (irrespective of their other peculiarities,) for certain Etymological reasons, looked upon as Præterite forms with a Present sense.

And the words *should*, *could*, *aught*, *dared* (or *durst*), *must*, *wist*, *might*, *mind*, are, for certain Etymological reasons, looked upon as Secondary Præterites.

This fact alters our view of the form *minded*. Instead of being a Secondary Præterite, it is a Tertiary one. *Geman* (the apparent Present) being dealt with as a Strong Præterite with a Present sense, *mind* (from the A. S. *gemunde*) is the Secondary Præterite, and *minded* (from the English *mind*) is a Tertiary Præterite. To analyse the word, the Præterite is first formed by the Vowel *a*, then by the addition of *-d*, and, thirdly, by the termination *-ed*; *man*, *mind*, *minded*.

The proof of this we collect from the Second Persons Singular, M. G. The Second Singular Præterite of the Strong class is *-t*; of the Weak class, *-es*; of the Present, both Weak and Strong, *-s*. Now the Second S. of the words in point is *skal-t*, *kan-t*, *áih-t*, *dar-t*? *mag-t*, *man-t*, respectively. D. G. i. 852.

Besides this, in A. S., the Plural forms are those of the Strong Præterites. See Rask, *p.* 79.

Yode.—The obsolete Præterite of *go*, now replaced by *went*, the Præterite of *wend*. Regular, except that the initial *g* has become *y*.

§ 204. *Remote origin, real or accredited, of the form in* D.

—In all the Gothic languages the termination of the Past Tense is either *da*, *ta*, *de*, ð*i*, *d*, *t*, or *-ed*, for the Singular, and *don*, *ton*, *tûmês*, or ð*um*, for the Plural. In other words *d*, or an allied sound, appears once, if not oftener.

In the Plural Præterite of the Mœso-Gothic we have something more, *viz.* the termination *dêdum ;* as *nas-idêdum*, *nas-idêduþ*, *nas-idêdun*, from *nas-ja ; sôk-idêdum*, *sôk-idêduþ*, *sôk-idêdun*, from *sôk-ja ; salb-ôdêdum*, *salb-ôdêduþ*, *sálb-ôdêdun*, from *salbô*. Here there is a second *d*. The same takes place with the Dual form *salb-ôdêduts*, and with the Subjunctive forms, *salb-ôdêdjáu*, *salb-ôdêdeis*, *salb-ôdêdi*, *salb-ôdêdeits*, *salb-ôdêdeima*, *salb ôdêdeiþ*, *salb-ôdêdeina*. It is considered by Grimm that in the syllable *dêd* we find the Verb *do ;* the English phrase *we did salve*, as compared with *salb-ôdêdum*, being looked on as confirmatory. D. G. i. 1042.

CHAPTER XIX.

ON CONJUGATION.

§ 205. THE current statement respecting Verbs like *sing* and *fall*, &c. &c., is that they are Irregular. How far this is the case may be seen from a review of the Twelve Classes in Mœso-Gothic, where the change of the Vowel is subject to fewer irregularities than elsewhere. In the Six first Conjugations the Præterite is replaced by a Perfect Tense. Consequently, there is a Reduplication. Of these the Fifth and Sixth superadd to the Reduplication a change of the Vowel.

Present.	*Past.**		*Past Participle.*	
	Sing.	*Plural.*		
1. Salta	sáisalt	sáisaltum	saltans	*leap.*
2. Háita	háiháit	háiháitum	háitans	*call.*
3. Hláupa	hláiláup	hláiláupum	hláupans	*run.*
4. Slêpa	sáizlêp	sáislêpum	slêpans	*sleep.*
5. Láia	láilô	láilôum	láilans	*laugh.*
6. Grêta	gáigrôt	gáigrôtum	grêtans	*weep.*
7. Svara	svôr	svôrum	svarans	*swear.*
8. Greipa	gráip	gripum	gripans	*gripe.*
9. Biuda	báuþ	budum	budans	*offer.*
10. Giba	gab	gêbum	gibans	*give.*
11. Stila	stal	stêlum	stulans	*steal.*
12. Rinna	rann	runnum	runnans	*run, flow.*

* Præterite, or Perfect.

Exhibited in a tabular form, the changes of the Vowels in Mœso-Gothic are as follows:

Prs.	*Pst. S.*	*Pst. Pl.*	*Part.*	*Prs.*	*Pst. S.*	*Pst. Pl.*	*Part.*
1. a	a	a	a	7. a	ô	ô	a
2. ái	ái	ái	ái	8. ei	ái	i	i
3. áu	áu	áu	áu	9. iu	áu	u	u
4. ê	ê	ê	ê	10. i	a	ê	i
5. ái	ô	ô	a	11. i	a	ê	u
6. ê	ô	ô	ê	12. i	a	u	u

§ 206. Such is the arrangement of the Strong Verbs in Mœso-Gothic, with which the arrangement of the Strong Verbs in the other Gothic languages may or may not coincide.

For a full and perfect coincidence three things are necessary: 1. the coincidence of form; 2. the coincidence of distribution; 3. the coincidence of order.

1. *Coincidence of form.*—Compared with the M. G. *rinna, rann, runnum, runnans,* the Old High German inflection coincides most rigidly; *e. g. rinnu, ran, runnumês, runnanêr.* The Vowel is the same in the two languages, and it is similarly changed in each. It is very evident that this might be otherwise. The Mœso-Gothic *i* might have become *e,* or the *u* might have become *o.* In this case the formula for the two languages would not have been the same. Instead of *i, a, u, u,* (see the tabular arrangement,) serving for the O. H. G. as well as the Mœso-Gothic, the formula would have been, for the M. G. *i, a, u, u,* and for the O. H. G. *e, a, u, u,* or *i, a, o, o.* The forms in this latter case would have been equivalent, but not the same.

2. *Coincidence of distribution.*—A given number of words in the Mœso-Gothic form their Præterites by changing *i* into *a;* in other words, a given number of Verbs in Mœso-Gothic are inflected like *rinna* and *rann.* The same is the case with the O. H. German. Now if these words are the

same in the two languages, the Mœso-Gothic and the Old High German (as far as the agreement extends) coincide in the distribution of their Verbs; that is, the same words are arranged in the same Class, or (changing the phrase) are distributed alike.

3. *Coincidence of order.*—The Conjugation to which the M. G. words *rinna* and *rann* belong is the Twelfth. The same is the case in O. H. G. It might, however, have been the case that in O. H. G. the class corresponding with the Twelfth in M. G. was the First, Second, Third, or any other.

Now a coincidence of Form, a coincidence of Distribution, and a coincidence of Order, in all the Classes of all the Gothic languages, is more than can be expected. If such were the case, the Tenses would be identical throughout.

Coincidence of Form is infringed upon by the simple tendency of sounds to change. *Hilpa* in Mœso-Gothic is *helpe* in A. S.; *hulpans* in M. G. is *holfanêr* in O. H. G. and *holpen* in Anglo-Saxon. A change, however, of this sort is insufficient to affect the arrangement. *Helpan*, in A. S., is placed in the same Class with *spinnan*; and all that can be said is, that the Mœso-Gothic *i* is, in Anglo-Saxon, represented not by *i* exclusively, but sometimes by *i* and sometimes by *ĕ*.

Coincidence of Distribution is of great Etymological importance. A word may in one stage of a language take the form of one Conjugation, and in another that of another. The word *climban* is, in A. S., placed in the same Conjugation with *drincan*, &c. &c. For this there was a reason; *viz.* the fact of the *i* being *short*. For the *i* being short there was a reason also. The *b* preceded the Vowel *a*, and consequently was sounded. This was the case whether the word was divided *clim-ban* or *climb-an*.

An, however, was no part of the original word, but only the sign of the Infinitive Mood. As such it became ejected. The letter *b* then came at the end of the word; but as the combination *mb*, followed by nothing, was unstable, *b* was soon lost in pronunciation. Now *b* being lost, the Vowel, which was once short, became lengthened, or rather it became the sound of the Diphthong *ei*; so that the word was no longer called *climb*, but *clime*. Now the words that follow the analogy of *spin*, *span*, &c. &c. (and consequently constitute the Twelfth Class), do so, not because the Vowel is *i*, but because it is a short *i*; and when the *i* is sounded like a Diphthong, the Præterite is formed differently. The A. S. Præterite of *climban* was sounded *clŏmm*, and rhymed to *from*; the English Præterite (when Strong) of *climb* is sounded *clōme*, rhyming to *roam*. The word *climb*, which was once classed with *spin* and *sing*, is now to be classed with *arise* and *smite*; in other words, it is distributed differently.

Coincidence in the order of the Classes is violated when a Class which was (for instance) the Third in one language, becomes, in another language, the Fourth, &c. &c. In Mœso-Gothic the Class containing the words *smeita*, *smáit*, *smitum*, *smitans*, is the Eighth. This is a natural place for it. In the Class preceding it, the Vowel is the same in both Numbers. In the Classes that follow it, the Vowel is changed in the Plural. The number of Classes that in M. G. change the Vowel is Five; *viz.* the Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth. Of these the Eighth is the First. The Classes where the change in question takes place form a natural subdivision, of which Class VIII. stands at the head. Now in A. S. the Vowel is not changed so much as in Mœso-Gothic. In words like *choose*, *give*, and *steal*, the Vowel remains unaltered. In M. G. however, these words are, respectively, of the

Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Classes. It is not till we get to the Eleventh that the Anglo-Saxon Plurals take a fresh Vowel. As the presence or absence of a change of Vowel naturally regulates the order of the Classes, the Eighth Class in M. G. becomes the Eleventh in Anglo-Saxon. If it were not so, the Classes where a change took place in the Plural would be separated from each other.

The later the stage of the language, the less complete the coincidence in the Classes.

Of the present arrangement, the Twelfth Class coincides most throughout the Gothic languages.

In the word *climb*, a reason was given for its having changed from Class XII. to Class XI. This, in the present state of our knowledge, cannot always be done.

These statements are made lest the reader should expect to find between the English and the Anglo-Saxon classification anything more than a partial coincidence. A detailed exhibition of the English Conjugations would form a work of itself. Moreover, the present Classes of the Strong Verbs must, to a great degree, be considered as provisional.

Observe, that it is the *Classes* of the Strong Verbs that are provisional. With the great Divisions into Weak and Strong, the case is far otherwise. The general assertions which will be made in § 208, respecting the Strong Conjugation, show most cogently that the division is a natural one.

§ 207. Preliminary, however, to making them, the reader's attention is directed to the following list of Verbs. In the present English they all form the Præterite in *-d* or *-t;* in A. S. they all formed it by a change of the Vowel. In other words they are Weak Verbs that were once Strong.

Præterites.

English.		*Anglo-Saxon.*	
Present.	*Præterite.*	*Present.*	*Præterite.*
Wreak	wreaked.	Wrece	wræ'c.
Fret	fretted.	Frete	fræ't.
Mete	meted.	Mete	mæ't.
Shear	sheared.	Scere	scear.
Braid	braided.	Brede	bræ'd.
Knead	kneaded.	Cnede	cnæ'd.
Dread	dreaded.	Dræ'de	dred.
Sleep	slept.	Sláþe	slep.
Fold	folded.	Fealde	feold.
Wield	wielded.	Wealde	weold.
Wax	waxed.	Weaxe	weox.
Leap	leapt.	Hleápe	hleop.
Sweep	swept.	Swáþe	sweop.
Weep	wept.	Wepe	weop.
Sow	sowed.	Sáwe	seow.
Bake	baked.	Bace	bók.
Gnaw	gnawed.	Gnage	gnóh.
Laugh	laughed.	Hlihhe	hlóh.
Wade	waded.	Wade	wód.
Lade	laded.	Hlade	hlód.
Grave	graved.	Grafe	gróf.
Shave	shaved.	Scafe	scóf.
Step	stepped.	Steppe	stóp.
Wash	washed.	Wacse	wócs.
Bellow	bellowed.	Belge	bealh.
Swallow	swallowed.	Swelge	swealh.
Mourn	mourned.	Murne	mearn.
Spurn	spurned.	Spurne	spearn.
Carve	carved.	Ceorfe	cearf.
Starve	starved.	Steorfe	stærf.
Thresh	threshed.	þersce	þærsc.
Hew	hewed.	Heawe	heow.
Flow	flowed.	Flówe	fleow.
Row	rowed.	Rówe	reow.
Creep	crept.	Creópe	creáp.
Dive	dived.	Deófe	deáf.
Shove	shoved.	Scéofe	sceáf.
Chew	chewed.	Ceówe	ceáw.
Brew	brewed.	Breówe	breáw.
Lock	locked.	Lùce	leác.

English.		*Anglo-Saxon.*	
Present.	*Præterite.*	*Present.*	*Præterite.*
Suck	sucked.	Sûce	seác.
Reek	reeked.	Reóce	reác.
Smoke	smoked.	Smeóce	smeác.
Bow	bowed.	Beóge	beáh.
Lie	lied.	Leóge	leáh.
Gripe	griped.	Grípe	gráp.
Span	spanned.	Spanne	spên.
Eke	eked.	Eáce	eóc.
Fare	fared.	Fare	fôr.

§ 208. The first of the general statements made concerning Strong Verbs, with a view of proving that the Order is *natural*, shall be the one arising out of the preceding list of Præterites.

I. Many Strong Verbs become Weak; whilst no Weak Verb ever becomes Strong.

II. All the Strong Verbs are of Saxon origin. None are Classical.

III. The greater number of them are Strong throughout the Gothic tongues.

IV. No new word is ever, upon its importation, inflected according to the Strong Conjugation. It is always Weak. As early as A. D. 1085, the French word *adouber*, *to dubb*, was introduced into English. Its Præterite was *dubbade*.*

V. All derived words are inflected Weak. The Intransitive forms *drink* and *lie*, are Strong; the Transitive forms *drench* and *lay*, are Weak.

The fourth statement will again be recurred to. The present object is to show that the division into Strong and Weak is natural.

§ 209. *Obsolete forms.* — Instead of *lept*, *slept*, *mowed*, *snowed*, &c. &c. &c., we find, in the Provincial dialects

* Philological Museum, ii. p. 387.

and in the older writers, the Strong forms *lep*, *slep*, *mew*, *snew*, &c. &c. This is no more than what, from § 208, we are led to expect. Here there are two forms, and each form is of a different Conjugation.

§ 210. *Double forms.*—In *lep* and *mew* we have two forms, of which one only is current. In *swoll* and *swelled*, in *clomb* and *climbed*, and in *hung* and *hanged*, we have two forms, of which both are current. These latter are true Double forms. Of Double forms there are two kinds.

1. Those like *swoll* and *swelled;* where there is the same Tense, but a different Conjugation.

2. Those like *spoke* and *spake;* where the Tense is the same and the Conjugation the same, but where the form is different.

The bearings of these Double forms (which, however, are points of general rather than of English Grammar) are as follows. Their number in a given language may be very great, and the Grammarian of a given language may call them, not Double forms of the same Tense, but different Tenses. Let the number of words like *swoll* and *swelled* be multiplied by 1000. The chances are that, in the present state of Etymology, they would be called First Præterites, and Second Præterites. The bearing of this remark upon the so-called Aorists and Futures of the Greek language is evident. I think that a writer in the Cambridge Philological Museum* indicates the true nature of those Tenses. They are the same Tense in a different Conjugation, and differ from *swoll* and *swelled* only in the frequency of their occurrence.

Difference of Form, and difference of Conjugation, may each simulate a difference of Tense.

* Vol. ii. p. 203.

CHAPTER XX.

DEFECTIVENESS AND IRREGULARITY.

§ 211. In § 148 the distinction between Irregularity and Defectiveness was slightly foreshadowed. In *p.* 238 it was exhibited in its principles. In the present Chapter the difference is more urgently insisted on.

The words that have hitherto served as illustrations are the Personal Pronouns *I* and *me*, and the Adjectives *good*, *better*, and *best*. See the Sections referred to above.

The view of these words was as follows; *viz.* that none of them were Irregular, but that they were all Defective. *Me* wanted the Nominative, *I* the Oblique Cases. *Good* was without a Comparative, *better* and *best* had no Positive Degree.

Now *me* and *better* may be said to make good the defectiveness of *I* and *good;* and *I* and *good* may be said to replace the forms wanting in *me* and *better*. This gives us the principle of Compensation. To introduce a new term, *I* and *me*, *good* and *better*, may be said to be Complementary to each other.

What applies to Nouns applies to Verbs also. *Go* and *went* are not Irregularities. *Go* is (at least in the present stage of our language) Defective in the Past Tense. *Went* (at least in its current sense) is without a Present. The two words, however, compensate their mutual deficiencies, and are to each other complementary.

The distinction between Defectiveness and Irregularity, is the first instrument of criticism for coming to true views concerning the proportion of the Regular and Irregular Verbs.

The second instrument of criticism in determining the Irregular Verbs, is the meaning that we attach to terms.

It is very evident that it is in the power of the Grammarian to raise the number of Etymological Irregularities to any amount, by narrowing the definition of the word Irregular; in other words, by framing an Exclusive Rule. The current rule of the common Grammarians is that the Præterite is formed *by the addition of -t, or -d, or -ed.* Now this position is sufficiently exclusive; since it proscribes not only the whole Class of Strong Verbs, but also words like *bent* and *sent*, where *t* exists, but where it does not exist as *an addition.* The Regular forms, it may be said, should be *bended* and *sended.*

Exclusive, however, as the rule in question is, it is plain that it might be made more so. The Regular forms might, by the *fiat* of a rule, be restricted to those in *-d.* In this case words like *wept* and *burnt* would be added to the already numerous list of Irregulars.

Finally, a further limitation might be made, by laying down as a rule that no word was Regular, unless it ended in *-ed.*

Thus much concerning the modes of making Rules exclusive, and, consequently, of raising the amount of Irregularities. This is the last art that the philosophic Grammarian is ambitious of acquiring. True Etymology reduces Irregularity by making the Rules of Grammar, not exclusive, but general. The *quantum* of Irregularity is in the inverse proportion to the generality of our Rules. In language itself there is no Irregularity. The word itself is only another name for our ignorance of the pro-

cesses that change words; and, as Irregularity is in the direct proportion to the exclusiveness of our Rules, the exclusiveness of our Rules is in the direct proportion to our ignorance of Etymological Processes.

The explanation of some fresh terms will lead us towards (but not to) the Definition of the word Irregular.

I. *Vital and Obsolete Processes.*—The word *moved* is formed from *move*, by the addition of *-d*. The addition of *-d* is the process by which the Present form is rendered Præterite. The word *fell* is formed from *fall*, by changing *a* into *e*. The change of vowel is the process by which the Present form is rendered Præterite. Of the two processes the result is the same. In what respect do they differ? This is foreshadowed in § 208. IV.

For further illustration let a new word be introduced into the language. Let a Præterite Tense of it be formed. This Præterite would be formed, not by changing the vowel, but by adding *-d*. No new verb ever takes a Strong Præterite. The like takes place with Nouns. No new Substantive would form its Plural, like *oxen* or *geese*, by adding *-en*, or by changing the vowel. It would rather, like *fathers* and *horses*, add the Lene Sibilant.

Now the processes that change *fall*, *ox*, and *goose* into *fell*, *oxen*, and *geese*, inasmuch as they cease to operate on the language in its present stage, are Obsolete Processes; whilst those that change *move* into *moved*, and *horse* into *horses*, operating on the language in its present stage, are Vital Processes.

A definition of the word Irregular might be so framed as to include all words whose forms could not be accounted for by the Vital Processes. Such a definition would, in the present English, make words like *bent*, *sought*, &c. (the euphonic processes being allowed for,) Regular, and all the Strong Verbs Irregular.

The very fact of so natural a Class as that of the Strong Verbs being reduced to the condition of Irregulars, invalidates such a definition as this.

II. *Processes of Necessity as opposed to Processes of Habit.* —For an indication of this distinction see § 139. I. The combinations *-pd-*, *-fd-*, *-kd-*, *-sd-*, and some others, (§§ 76, 114, *p.* 168, 139,) are unpronounceable. Hence words like *step*, *quaff*, *back*, *kiss*, &c. take after them the sound of *-t: stept*, *quafft*, &c. &c. (the *sound* being represented) being their Præterites, instead of *stepd*, *quaffd*. Here the change from *-d* (the natural termination) to *-t* is a matter (or process) of Necessity. It is not so with words like *weep* and *wept*, &c. &c. Here the change of vowel is not necessary. *Weept* might have been said if the Habit of the language had permitted.

A definition of the word Irregular might be so framed as to include all words whose natural form was modified by any euphonic process whatever. In this case *stept* (modified by a process of Necessity) and *wept* (modified by a process of Habit) would be equally Irregular.

A less limited definition might account words Regular as long as the process by which they were deflected from their natural form was a process of Necessity. Those, however, which were modified by a process of Habit it would class with the Irregulars.

Definitions thus limited arise from ignorance of euphonic processes, or rather from an ignorance of the generality of their operation.

III. *Ordinary Processes as opposed to Extraordinary Processes.*—The whole scheme of language is Analogical. A new word introduced into a language takes the forms of its Cases or Tenses, &c. &c. from the forms of the Cases or Tenses, &c. &c. of the old words. The analogy is extended. Now few forms (if any) are so unique as not to

have some others corresponding with them; and few processes of change are so unique as not to affect more words than one. The forms *wept* and *slept* correspond with each other. They are brought about by the same process; *viz.* by the shortening of the vowel in *weep* and *sleep*. The analogy of *weep* is extended to *sleep*, and *vice versâ*. Changing our expression, a common influence affects both words. The alteration itself is an ultimate fact. The extent of its influence is an instrument of classification. When processes affect a considerable number of words, they may be called Ordinary Processes; as opposed to Extraordinary Processes, which affect one or few words.

When a word stands by itself, with no other corresponding to it, we confess our ignorance, and say that it is affected by an Extraordinary Process, by a process peculiar to itself, or by a process to which we know nothing similar.

A definition of the word Irregular might be so framed as to include all words affected by Extraordinary Processes; the rest being considered Regular.

IV. *Positive Processes as opposed to Ambiguous Processes.* —The words *wept* and *slept* are similarly affected. Each is changed from *weep* and *sleep* respectively; and we know that the process which affects the one is the process that affects the other also. Here there is a Positive Process.

Reference is now made to words of a different sort. The nature of the word *worse* is explained in *p.* 239, and the reader is referred to the Section. There the form is accounted for in two ways, of which only one can be the true one. Of the two processes, each might equally have brought about the present form. Which of the two it was, we are unable to say. Here the process is Ambiguous.

A definition of the word Irregular might be so framed as to include all words affected by Ambiguous Processes.

V. *Normal Processes as opposed to Processes of Confu-*

sion.—Let a certain word come under Class A. Let all words under Class A be similarly affected. Let a given word come under Class A. This word will be affected even as the rest of Class A is affected. The process affecting, and the change resulting, will be Normal, Regular, or Analogical.

Let, however, a word, instead of really coming under Class A, *appear* to do so. Let it be dealt with accordingly. The Analogy then is a false one. The Principle of Imitation is a wrong one. The Process affecting is a Process of Confusion.

Examples of this (a few amongst many) are words like *songstress* (*p.* 201), *theirs* (*p.* 228), *minded* (*p.* 300), where the words *songstr—*, *their—*, and *mind—*, are dealt with as roots, which they are not.

Ambiguous Processes, Extraordinary Processes, Processes of Confusion—each, or all of these, are legitimate reasons for calling words Irregular. The practice of Etymologists will determine what definition is most convenient.

With Extraordinary Processes we know nothing about the word. With Ambiguous Processes we are unable to make a choice. With Processes of Confusion we see the analogy, but, at the same time, see that it is a false one.

§ 212. *Could.*—With all persons who pronounce the *l* this word is truly Irregular. The A. S. form is *cuðe.* The *-l* is inserted by a Process of Confusion.

Can, cunne, canst, cunnon, cunnan, cuðe, cuðon, cuð — such are the remaining forms in A. S. None of them account for the *l.* The presence of the *l* makes the word *could* irregular. No reference to the allied languages accounts for it.

Notwithstanding this, the presence of the *l* is accounted for. In *would* and *should* the *l* has a proper place. It

is part of the original words, *will* and *shall*. A false analogy looked upon *could* in the same light. Hence a true irregularity; *provided that the* L *be pronounced.*

The L, however, is pronounced by few, and that only in pursuance to the spelling. This reduces the word *could* to an Irregularity, not of Language, but only of Orthography.

That the mere ejection of the *n* in *can*, and that the mere lengthening of the vowel, are not irregularities, we learn from a knowledge of the processes that convert the Greek ὀδοντος (*odontos*) into ὀδῦς (*odows*).

§ 213. The Verb *quoth* is truly Defective. It is found in only one Tense, one Number, and one Person. It is the Third Person Singular of the Præterite Tense. It has the further peculiarity of preceding its Pronoun. Instead of saying *he quoth*, we say *quoth he.* In A. S., however, it was not Defective. It was found in the other Tenses, in the other Number, and in other Moods. *Ic cweðe, þú cwyst, he cwyð. Ic cwað, þú cwaðe, he cwæð, we cwædon, ge cwædon, hi cwædon.* Imperative, *cweð.* Participle, *gecweden.* In the Scandinavian it is current in all its forms. There, however, it means, not *to speak* but, *to sing.* As far as its Conjugation goes, it is Strong. As far as its Class goes it follows the form of *speak, spoke.* Like *speak*, its A. S. form is in *æ*, as *cwæð.* Like one of the forms of *speak*, its English form is in *o*, as *quoth, spoke.*

The whole of the present Chapter is indicative of the nature of Irregularity, and of the elements that should enter into the definition of it, rather than exhaustive of the detail.

The principle that I recognize for myself is to consider no word Irregular unless it can be proved so. This includes the words affected by Ambiguous Processes, and by Processes of Confusion, and no others. The words

affected by Extraordinary Processes form a Provisional Class, which a future increase of our Etymological knowledge may show to be Regular. *Worse* and *could* (its spelling being considered) are the fairest specimens of our Irregulars. The Class, instead of filling pages, is exceedingly limited.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE IMPERSONAL VERBS.

§ 214. *Meseems.*—Equivalent to *it seems to me; mihi videtur*, φαίνεταί μοι. The Verb *seems* is Intransitive; consequently the Pronoun *me* has the power of a Dative Case. The Pronoun *it* is not required to accompany the Verb.

§ 215. *Methinks.*—In A. S. there are two forms; þencan, *to think*, and þincan, *to seem.* It is from the latter form that the Verb in *methinks* comes. Such being the case, it is Intransitive, and consequently the Pronoun *me* has the power of a Dative Case. The Pronoun *it* is not required to accompany the Verb.

Of this word we have also the Past form *methought.*

> Methought I saw my late espoused wife
> Brought to me, like Alcestis, from the grave.—Milton.

§ 216. *Me listeth*, or *me lists.*—Equivalent to *it pleases me, me juvat.* A. S. *lystan, to wish, to choose*, also *to please, to delight;* Norse, *lysta.* Unlike the other two, the Verb is Transitive, so that the Pronoun *me* has the power of an Accusative Case. The Pronoun *it* is not required to accompany the Verb.

These three are the only true Impersonal Verbs in the English language. They form a Class by themselves, because no Pronoun accompanies them, as is the case with the equivalent expressions *it appears, it pleases*, and with all the other Verbs in the language.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE VERB SUBSTANTIVE.

§ 217. THE Verb Substantive is generally dealt with as an Irregular Verb. The remarks in Chapter XX. have indicated the impropriety of this view. The true notion is, that the idea of *being* or *existing* is expressed by three different Verbs, each of which is defective in some of its parts. The parts, however, that are wanting in one Verb, are made up by the Inflections of one of the others. There is, for example, no Præterite of the Verb *am*, and no Present of the Verb *was*. The absence, however, of the Present form in *was* is made up by the word *am*, and the absence of the Præterite form of *am* is made up by the word *was*.

§ 218. *Was.*—Defective, except in the Præterite Tense, where it is found both in the Indicative and Conjunctive.

Indicative.		*Conjunctive.*	
Sing.	*Plur.*	*Sing.*	*Plur.*
1. Was.	Were.	1. Were.	Were.
2. Wast.	Were.	2. Wert.	Were.
3. Was.	Were.	3. Were.	Were.

In the older stages of the Gothic languages the word has both a Full Conjugation and a Regular one. In A. S. it has an Infinitive, a Participle Present, and a Participle Past. In Mœso-Gothic it is inflected throughout with *s;*

as *visa, vas, vêsum, visans.* In that language it has the power of the Latin *maneo, to remain.* The *r* first appears in the O. H. G ; *wisu, was, wârumês, wësaner.* In Norse the *s* entirely disappears, and the word is inflected with *r* throughout; *vera, var, vorum,* &c. &c.

§ 219. *Be.*—Inflected in A. S. throughout the Present Tense, both Indicative and Subjunctive; found also as an Infinitive *beón,* as a Gerund *to beonne,* and as a Participle *beonde.*

Present.

Indicative.		*Conjunctive.*		*Imperative.*	
Sing.	*Plur.*	*Sing.*	*Plur.*	*Sing.*	*Plur.*
1. Be.	—	Be.	Be.	—	Be.
2. Beest.	—	Beest?	Be.	Be.	Be.
3. —	—	Be.	Be, Bin.	Be.	Be.

Infin. To be. *Pres. P.* Being. *Past Part.* Been.

The line in Milton beginning *If thou beest he*—(P. L. b. ii.), leads to the notion that the antiquated form *beest* is not Indicative, but Conjunctive. Such, however, is not the case: *býst* in A. S. is Indicative, the Conjunctive form being *beó.—And every thing that pretty bin* (Cymbeline).—Here the word *bin* is the Conjunctive Plural, in A. S. *beón;* so that the words *every thing* are to be considered equivalent to the Plural form *all things.* The phrase in Latin would stand thus, *quotquot pulcra sint;* in Greek thus, ὰ ἀν κάλα ᾖ. The *Indicative* Plural is, in A. S., not *beón,* but *beóð* and *beó.*

§ 220. In the D. G. i. 1051, it is stated that the Anglo-Saxon forms *beó, bist, bið, beoð,* or *beó,* have not a Present, but a Future sense; that, whilst *am* means *I am,* &c., *beó* means *I shall be*; and that in the older languages it is only where the form *am* is not found that *be* has the power of a Present form. The same root occurs in the Slavonic and Lithuanic tongues with the same power; as, *esmi,* I am;

búsu, I shall be, Lithuanic.—*Esmu*, I am; *buhshu*, I shall be, Livonic.—*Jesm*, I am; *budu*, I shall be, Slavonic.—*Gsem*, I am; *budu*, I shall be, Bohemian. This, however, proves, not that there is in A. S. a Future Tense (or Form), but that the word *bcó* has a Future sense. There is no fresh Tense where there is no fresh form.

§ 221. *Am.*—Of this form it should be stated, that the letter *m* is no part of the original word. It is the sign of the First Person, just as it is in all the Indo-European languages.

It should also be stated, that, although the fact be obscured, and although the changes be insufficiently accounted for, the forms *am*, *art*, *are*, and *is*, are not, like *am* and *was*, parts of different words, but forms of one and the same word; in other terms, that, although between *am* and *be* there is no Etymological connexion, there is one between *am* and *is*. This we collect from the Comparison of the Indo-European languages.

	1.	2.	3.
Sanskrit	*Asmi.*	*Asi.*	*Asti.*
Zend	*Ahmi.*	*Ahi.*	*Ashti.*
Greek	Ἐιμι.	Ἐισ.	Ἐι.
Latin	*Sum.*	*Es.*	*Est.*
Armenian	*Yem.*	—	—
Lithuanic	*Esmi.*	*Essi.*	*Esti.*
Old Slavonic . . .	*Yesmy.*	*Yesi.*	*Yesty.*
Mœso-Gothic . . .	*Im.*	*Is.*	*Ist.*
Old Saxon	—	**Is.*	*Ist.*
Anglo-Saxon	*Eom.*	*Eart.*	*Is.*
Icelandic	*Em.*	*Ert.*	*Er.*
English	*Am.*	*Art.*	*Is.*

In English and A. S. the word is found in the Present Indicative only. In English it is inflected through both Numbers; in A. S. in the Singular Number only. The A. S. Plurals are forms of the German *seyn*, a Verb whereof we have, in the present English, no vestiges.

* Found rarely; *bist* being the current form.—D. G. i. 894.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

§ 222. THE Present Participle, called also the Active Participle and the Participle in *-ing*, is formed from the original word by adding *-ing;* as *move, moving.* In the older languages the termination was more marked, being *-nd.* Like the Latin Participle in *-ns*, it was originally declined. The M. G. and O. H. G. forms are *habands* and *hapêntêr* (*having*), respectively. The *-s*, in the one language, and the *-êr* in the other, are the signs of the Case and Gender. In the O. S. and A. S. the forms are *-and* and *-ande;* as *bindand, bindande, binding.* In all the Norse languages, ancient and modern, the *-d* is preserved. So it is in the Old Lowland Scotch, and in many of the modern Provincial dialects of England, where *strikand, goand,* is said for *striking, going.* In Staffordshire, where the *-ing* is pronounced *ingg*, there is a fuller sound than that of the current English. In Old English the form in *-nd* is predominant, in Middle English the use fluctuates, and in New English the termination *-ing* is universal. In the Scotch of the modern writers we find the form *-in.**

* The rising sun o'er Galston muirs
Wi' glorious light was glintin';
The hares were hirplin' down the furs,
The lav'rocks they were chantin'.
BURNS' HOLY FAIR.

It is with the Oblique Cases of the Present Participles of the Classical languages, rather than with the Nominative, that we must compare the corresponding Participle in Gothic; *e. g.* ἔχοντ-ος (*ekhontos*) Greek; *habent-is*, Latin; *hapênt-êr*, O. H. G.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE PAST PARTICIPLE.

§ 223. THE Participle in *-en.*—In the Anglo-Saxon this Participle was declined like the Adjectives. Like the Adjectives, it is, in the present English, undeclined.

§ 224. In A. S. it always ended in *-en*, as *sungen, funden, bunden.* In English this *-en* is often wanting, as *found, bound;* the word *bounden* being antiquated. Words where the *-en* is wanting may be viewed in two lights; 1. they may be looked upon as Participles that have lost their termination; 2. they may be considered as Præterites with a Participial sense.

§ 225. *Drank, drunk, drunken.*—With all words wherein the Vowel of the Plural differs from that of the Singular, the Participle takes the Plural form. To say *I have drunk*, is to use an ambiguous expression; since *drunk* may be either a Participle *minus* its termination, or a Præterite with a Participial sense. To say *I have drank*, is to use a Præterite for a Participle. To say I have *dranken*, is to use an impossible form.

In all words with a double form, as *spake* and *spoke*, *brake* and *broke*, *clave* and *clove*, the Participle follows the form in *o*, as *spoken, broken, cloven. Spaken, braken, claven*, are impossible forms. There are degrees in laxity of language, and to say the *spear is broke* is better than to say the *spear is brake.*

These two statements bear upon the future history of the Præterite. That of the two forms *sang* and *sung*, one will, in the course of language, become obsolete is nearly certain; and, as the Plural form is also that of the Participle, it is the Plural form which is most likely to be the surviving one.

§ 226. As a general rule, we find the Participle in *-en* wherever the Præterite is Strong; indeed, the Participle in *-en* may be called the Strong Participle, or the Participle of the Strong Conjugation. Still the two forms do not always coincide. In *mow, mowed, mown; sow, sowed, sown;* and several other words, we find the Participle Strong, and the Præterite Weak. I remember no instances of the converse. This is only another way of saying that the Præterite has a greater tendency to pass from Strong to Weak than the Participle.

§ 227. In the Latin language the change from *s* to *r*, and *vice versâ*, is very common. We have the double forms *arbor* and *arbos*, *honor* and *honos*, &c. &c. Of this change we have a few specimens in English. The words *rear* and *raise*, as compared with each other, are examples. In A. S. a few words undergo a similar change in the Plural Number of the Strong Præterites.

Cεόse, *I choose;* cεás, *I chose;* curon, *we chose;* gecoren, *chosen.*
Forlεόse, *I lose;* forlεás, *I lost;* forluron, *we lost;* forloren, *lost.*
Hreose, *I rush;* hreás, *I rushed;* hruron, *we rushed;* gehroren, *rushed.*

This accounts for the Participial form *forlorn*, or *lost*, in N. H. G. *verloren*. In Milton's lines,

——————— the piercing air
Burns *frore*, and cold performs the effect of fire.
P. L., b. ii.

we have a form from the A. S. Participle *gefroren* = *frozen*.

§ 228. The Participle in *-d*, *-t*, or *-ed*.—In the Anglo-Saxon this Participle was declined like the Adjective. Like the Adjectives, it is, in the present English, undeclined.

In A. S. it differed in form from the Præterite, inasmuch as it ended in *-ed* or *-t*, whereas the Præterite ended in *-ode*, *-de*, or *-te;* as *lufode*, *bærnde*, *dypte*, Præterites; *gelufod*, *bærned*, *dypt*, Participles.

As the ejection of the *e* reduces words like *bærned* and *bærnde* to the same form, it is easy to account for the present identity of form between the Weak Præterites and the Participles in *-d; e. g. I moved*, *I am moved*, &c. &c.

§ 229. In the older writers, and in works written, like Thompson's Castle of Indolence, in imitation of them, we find prefixed to the Præterite Participle the letter *y*, as *yclept* (*called*); *yclad* (*clothed*); *ydrad* (*dreaded*). The older forms of this was *ge*, A. S.; *gi*, O. S.; *ki*, O. H. G.; *ga*, M. G. In the Norse languages it is wholly wanting. In the present German it is a constant prefix; as *gefunden*, found; *gelebt*, lived. From its absence in the Norse, and the irregularity of its appearance elsewhere, we infer that it is a Prefix of the Verb in general, rather than an essential element of the Participle. In A. S. it occasionally indicates a difference of sense; as *hâten*, called; *gehâten*, promised; *boren*, borne; *geboren*, born (*natus*).—D. G. i. 1016.

CHAPTER XXV.

COMPOSITION.

§ 230. In the following words, amongst many others, we have palpable and indubitable specimens of Composition. *Day-star*, *vine-yard*, *sun-beam*, *apple-tree*, *ship-load*, *silver-smith*, &c. &c. The words *palpable* and *indubitable* have been used, because, in many cases, as will be seen hereafter, it is difficult to determine whether a word be a true Compound or not.

Now, in each of the Compounds quoted above, it may be seen that it is the second word which is qualified, or defined, by the first, and that it is not the first which is qualified, or defined, by the second. Of *yards*, *beams*, *trees*, *loads*, *smiths*, there may be many sorts, and, in order to determine what *particular* sort of *yard*, *beam*, *tree*, *load*, or *smith*, may be meant, the words *vine*, *sun*, *apple*, *ship*, and *silver*, are prefixed. In Compound words it is the *first* term that defines or particularizes the second.

That the idea given by the word *apple-tree* is not referable to the words *apple* and *tree*, irrespective of the order in which they occur, may be seen by reversing the position of them. The word *tree-apple*, although not existing in the language, is as correct a word as *thorn-apple*. In *tree-apple*, the particular sort of *apple* meant is denoted by the word *tree*, and if there were in our gardens various sorts of plants called apples, of which some grew along

the ground and others upon trees, such a word as *tree-apple* would be required in order to be opposed to *earth-apple*, or *ground-apple*, or some word of the kind.

In the Compound words *tree-apple* and *apple-tree*, we have the same elements differently arranged. However, as the word *tree-apple* is not current in the language, the Class of Compounds indicated by it may seem to be merely imaginary. Nothing is farther from being the case. A *tree-rose* is a rose of a particular sort. The generality of roses being on *shrubs*, this grows on a *tree*. Its peculiarity consists in this fact, and this particular character is expressed by the word *tree prefixed*. A *rose-tree* is a *tree* of a particular sort, distinguished from *apple-trees*, and *trees* in general, (in other words, particularized or defined) by the word *tree prefixed*.

A *ground-nut* is a *nut* particularized by growing in the ground. A *nut-ground* is a *ground* particularized by producing nuts.

A *finger-ring*, as distinguished from *ear-rings*, and from *rings* in general, (and so particularized,) is a *ring* for the *finger*. A *ring-finger*, as distinguished from *fore-fingers*, and from *fingers* in general, (and so particularized,) is a *finger* whereon *rings* are worn.

At times this rule seems to be violated. The words *spitfire* and *daredevil* seem exceptions to it. At the first glance it seems, in the case of a *spitfire*, that what he (or she) *spits* is *fire;* and that, in the case of a *daredevil*, what he (or she) *dares* is the *devil*. In this case the initial words *spit* and *dare*, are particularized by the final ones *fire* and *devil*. The true idea, however, confirms the original rule. A *spitfire* voids his fire by spitting. A *daredevil*, in meeting the Fiend, would not shrink from him, but would defy him. A *spitfire* is not one who spits fire, but one whose fire is *spit*. A *daredevil* is not one

who dares even the devil, but one by whom the devil is even dared.

§ 231. Of the two elements of a Compound word, which is the most important? In one sense the latter, in another sense the former. The latter word is the most *essential;* since the general idea of *trees* must exist before it can be defined or particularized; so becoming the idea which we have in *apple-tree*, *rose-tree*, &c. &c. The former word, however, is the most *influential.* It is by this that the original idea is qualified. The latter word is the staple original element: the former is the superadded influencing element. Compared with each other, the former element is Active, the latter Passive. Etymologically speaking, the former element, in English Compounds, is the most important.

Is it because the former element is the most important that it is placed first? I am not prepared to say this. It is not certain, either, that the most important of two words *naturally* comes first, or that, in the majority of languages, it actually comes first. I know no reason why, in another language, a word like *tree-rose* should not have the meaning of the English word *rose-tree*, and *vice versâ.* There is no natural reason for the most important word standing first; there is, however, a natural reason for the most important word *taking the Accent.* Now in all the English Compounds it is on the most important word that the Accent lies. The Accent lies on it *because* it is the most important. It is also the habit of the Gothic languages to throw the Accent from the last syllable backwards. Hence, in Compound words—*dáy-star*, *víne-yard*, *sún-beam*, *ápple-tree*, *thórn-apple*, *róse-tree*, *shíp-load*, &c. &c. —*the first element is Accented because it is the most important, and it is Accented because it is first.*

§ 232. Most numerous are the observations that bear

upon the Composition of words; *e. g.* how Nouns combine with Nouns, as in *sunbeam;* Nouns with Verbs, as in *daredevil,* &c. &c. &c. It is thought sufficient in the present work to be content with, 1. defining the meaning of the term Composition; 2. explaining the nature of some obscure Compounds.

§ 233. Composition is the joining together, *in language,* of two, or more, *different words,* and *treating the Combination as a single term.* Observe the words in Italics.

In language.—A great number of our Compounds, like the word *merry-making,* are divided by the sign -, or the hyphen. It is very plain that if all words *spelt* with a hyphen were to be considered as Compounds, the formation of them would be not a matter of speech, or language, but one of writing or spelling. This distinguishes Compounds in language, from mere printers' Compounds.

Different.—In O. H. G. we find the form *sëlp-sëlpo.* Here there is the junction of two words, but not the junction of two *different* ones. This distinguishes Composition from Gemination.—Grimm, D. G. iii. 405.

Words.—In *father-s, clear-er, four-th,* &c. &c., there is the addition of a letter or a syllable, and it may be even of the part of a word. There is no addition, however, of a whole word. This distinguishes Composition from Derivation.

Treating the Combination as a single Term.—In determining, in certain cases, between Derived words and Compound words, there is an occasional perplexity; the perplexity, however, is far greater in determining between a Compound word and *two words.* In the eyes of one Grammarian the term *mountain height* may be as truly a Compound word as *sunbeam.* In the eyes of another Grammarian it may be no Compound word, but two words, just as *Alpine height* is two words; *mountain* being dealt

with as an Adjective. It is in the determination of this that the Accent plays an important part. This fact was foreshadowed in the Chapter upon Accents (*p.* 134).

§ 234. The attention of the reader is drawn to the following line, slightly altered, from Churchill:

"Then rést, my friénd, *and spáre* thy précious bréath."

On each of the syllables *rest*, *friend*, *spare*, *prec*, *breath*, there is an Accent. Each of these syllables must be compared with the one that precedes it; *rest* with *then*, *friend* with *my*, and so on throughout the line. Compared with the word *and*, the word *spare* is not only Accented, but the Accent is conspicuous and prominent. There is so little Accent on *and*, and so much on *spare*, that the disparity of Accent is very manifest.

Now, if in the place of *and*, there was some other word, a word not so much accented as *spare*, but still more accented than *and*, this disparity would be diminished, and the accents of the two words might be said to be at *par*, or nearly so. As said before, the line was slightly altered from Churchill, the real reading being

Then rést, my friénd, *spare*, *spare* thy précious breath.—

In the true reading we actually find what had previously only been supposed. In the words *spare*, *spare*, the accents are nearly at *par*. Such the difference between Accent at *par* and Disparity of Accent.

Good illustrations of the Parity and Disparity of Accent may be drawn from certain names of places. Let there be such a sentence as the following; *The lime house near the bridge north of the new port.* Compare the Parity of Accent on the separate words *lime* and *house*, *bridge* and *north*, *new* and *port*, with the Disparity of Accent in the Compound words *Límehouse*, *Brídgenorth*, and *Néwport*. The sepa-

rate words *beef steak*, where the Accent is nearly at *par*, compared with the Compound word *sweépstakes*, where there is a great Disparity of Accent, are further illustrations of the same difference.

The difference between a Compound word and two words is greatest where the first is an Adjective. This we see in comparing such terms as the following; *blǻck bírd*, meaning a *bird that is black*, with *blǻckbird* = the Latin *merula;* or *blúe béll*, meaning a *bell that is blue*, with *blúebell* the flower. Expressions like *a shárp edgéd instrument*, meaning *an instrument that is sharp and has edges*, as opposed to *a shárp-edged instrument*, meaning *an instrument with sharp edges*, further exemplify this difference.

Subject to four small classes of exceptions, it may be laid down that, in the English Language, *there is no Composition unless there is either a change of form or a change of accent.*

The reader is now informed that unless, in what has gone before, he has taken an exception to either a statement or an inference, he has either seen beyond what has been already laid down by the author, or else has read him with insufficient attention. This may be shown by drawing a distinction between a Compound Form and a Compound Idea.

In the words *a red house*, each word preserves its natural and original meaning, and the statement is *that a house is red.* By a parity of reasoning *a mad house* should mean a *house that is mad;* and, provided that each word retain its natural meaning and its natural accent, such is the fact. Let a *house* mean, as it often does, a *family.* Then the phrase, *a mad house*, means that the *house, or family, is mad*, just as *a red house* means that the *house is red.* Such, however, is not the current meaning of the word. Every one knows that *a mad house* means *a house for mad men;*

in which case it is treated as a Compound word, and has a marked accent on the first syllable, just as *Límehouse* has. Now, compared with the word *red house*, meaning a house of a *red colour*, and compared with the words *mad house*, meaning a *deranged family*, the word *mádhouse*, in its common sense, expresses a Compound Idea, as opposed to two ideas, or a Double Idea. The word *beef steak* is evidently a Compound Idea; but, as there is no disparity of accent, it is not a Compound word. Its sense is Compound; its form is not Compound, but Double. This indicates the objection anticipated, which is this; *viz.* that a definition, which would exclude such a word as *beef steak* from the list of Compounds, is, for that very reason, exceptionable. I answer to this, that the term in question is a Compound Idea, and not a Compound Form; in other words, that it is a Compound in Logic, but not a Compound in Etymology. Now Etymology, taking cognizance of Forms only, has nothing to do with Ideas, except so far as they influence Forms.

Such the commentary upon the words, "*treating the combination as a single term;*" in other words, such the difference between a Compound word and Two words. The rule, being repeated, stands (subject to four classes of exceptions) thus. *There is no true Composition without either a change of Form or a change of Accent.* As I wish to be clear upon this point, I shall illustrate the statement by its application.

The word *trée-rose* is often pronounced *trée róse;* that is, with the accent at *par.* It is Compound in the one case; it is Two words in the other.

The words *mountain ash* and *mountain height* are generally (perhaps always) pronounced with an equal accent on the syllables *mount-* and *ash*, *mount-* and *height*, respectively. In this case the word *mountain* must be dealt with as an

Adjective, and the words considered two. The word *moúntain-wave* is often pronounced with a visible diminution of accent on the last syllable. In this case there is a disparity of accent, and the word is Compound.

The following quotation indicates a further cause of perplexity in determining between Compound words and Two words.

1.

A wet sheet and a blowing gale,
  A breeze that follows fast ;
That fills the white and swelling sail,
  And bends the *gallant mast*.

ALLAN CUNNINGHAM.

2.

Britannia needs no bulwarks,
  No towers along the steep ;
Her march is o'er the *mountain-wave*,
  Her home is on the deep.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

To speak first of the word (or words) *gallant mast*. If *gallant* means *brave*, there are *two words*. If the words be two, there is a stronger accent on *mast*. If the accent on *mast* be stronger, the rhyme with *fast* is more complete; in other words, the metre favours the notion of the words being considered as *two*. *Gallant-mast*, however, may be a Compound word, with an especial nautical meaning. In this case the accent is stronger on *gal-* and weaker on *-mast*. This, however, is not the state of things that the metre favours. The same applies to *mountain wave*. The same person who in Prose would throw a stronger accent on *mount-* and a weaker one on *wave*, (so dealing with the word as a Compound,) might, in Poetry, make the words *two*, by giving to the last syllable a parity of accent.

The following quotation from Ben Jonson may be read in two ways; and the accent may vary with the reading.

1.

Lay thy bow of pearl apart,
And thy *silver shining* quiver.

2.

Lay thy bow of pearl apart,
And thy *silver-shining* quiver.

CYNTHIA'S REVELS.

§ 235. *On certain words wherein the fact of their being Compound is obscured.*—Composition is the addition of a word to a word, Derivation is the addition of Letters or Syllables to a word. In a Compound form each element has a separate and independent existence; in a Derived form, only one of the elements has such. Now it is very possible that in an older stage of a language two words may exist, may be put together, and may so form a Compound; at the time in point each word having a separate and independent existence: whilst, in a later stage of language, only one of these words may have a separate and independent existence, the other having become obsolete. In this case a Compound word would take the appearance of a Derived one, since but one of its elements could be exhibited as a separate and independent word. Such is the case with, amongst others, the word *bishopric*. In the present language the word *ric*, has no separate and independent existence. For all this, the word is a true Compound, since, in Anglo-Saxon, we have the noun *rice*, as a separate, independent word, signifying *kingdom* or *domain*.

Again, without becoming obsolete, a word may alter its form. This is the case with most of our Adjectives in *-ly*. At present they appear Derivative; their termination *-ly* having no separate and independent existence. The older language, however, shows that they are Compounds; since *-ly* is nothing else than *-lic*, A. S.; *-lih*, O. H. G.; *-leiks*,

M. G.: = *like*, or *similis*, and equally with it an independent separate word.

For the following words a separate independent root is presumed rather than shown. It is presumed, however, on grounds that satisfy the Etymologist.

Mis-, as in *misdeed*, &c. &c.—M. G. *missô*, in turns; O. Norse, *á mis*, alternately; M. H. G. *misse*, mistake. The original notion *alternation*, thence *change*, thence *defect*. Compare the Greek ἄλλως.—Grimm, D. G. ii. 470.

Dom, as in *wisdom*, &c. &c.—The Substantive *dôm* presumed.—D. G. ii. 491.

Hood and *head*, as in *Godhead*, *manhood*, &c. &c. The Substantive *háids* = person, order, kind, presumed.—D. G. ii. 497. Nothing to do with the word *head*.

Ship, as in *friendship*.—A. S. *-scipe* and *-sceäft*; Germ. *-schaft*; M. G. *gaskafts*, a *creature*, or *creation*. The Substantive *skafts* or *skap* presumed. The *-skip* or *-scape* in *landskip* is only an older form.—D. G. ii. 522.

Less, as in *sleepless*, &c. &c. has nothing to do with *less*. Derived from *-láus*, *lôs*, *destitute of* = Lat. *expers*.—D. G. ii. 565.

For the further details, which are very numerous, see the D. G. Vol. iii.

§ 236. "Subject to four Classes of exceptions, it may be "laid down that *there is no true Composition unless there is* "*either a change of Form or a change of Accent*."—Such the statement made in *p.* 333. The First Class of exceptions consists of those words where the natural tendency to disparity of Accent is traversed by some rule of Euphony. For example, let two words be put together, which at their point of contact form a combination of sounds foreign to our habits of pronunciation. The rarity of the combination will cause an effort in utterance. The effort in utterance will cause an accent to be laid on the latter half of the

Compound. This will equalize the accent, and abolish the disparity. The word *Monkshood*, the name of a flower (*Aconitum Napellus*), where, to my ear at least, there is quite as much accent on the *-hood* as on the *monks-*, may serve in the way of illustration. *Monks* is one word, *hood* another. When joined together, the *h-* of the *-hood* is put in immediate apposition with the *-s* of the *Monks-*. Hence the combination *Monkshood*. At the letters *s* and *h* is the point of contact. Now the sound of *s* followed immediately by the sound of *h* is a true Aspirate. But true Aspirates (see § 82) are rare in the English language. Being of rare occurrence, the pronunciation of them is a matter of attention and effort; and this attention and effort creates an accent which otherwise would be absent. Hence words like *Monkshóod*, *well-héad*, and some others.

Real reduplications of Consonants (see *p.* 118), as in *hop-pole*, may have the same parity of accent with the true Aspirates: and for the same reasons. They are rare combinations that require effort and attention.

The Second Class of exceptions contains those words wherein between the first element and the second there is so great a disparity, either in the length of the Vowel, or the length of the Syllable *en masse* (see § 93), as to counteract the natural tendency of the first element to become accented. One of the few specimens of this Class, (which after all may consist of double words,) is the term *upstánding*. Here it should be remembered, that words like *hapházard*, *foolhárdy*, *uphólder*, and *withhóld* come under the First Class of the exceptions.

The Third Class of exceptions contains words like *perchánce* and *perháps*. In all respects but one these are double words, just as *by chance* is a double word. *Per*, however, differs from *by* in having no separate existence.

This sort of words we owe to the multiplicity of elements (Classical and Gothic) in the English Language.

To anticipate objections to the Rule respecting the Disparity of Accent, it may be well to state in fresh terms a fact already indicated, viz. that the same combination of words may in one sense be Compound, and in the other double (or two). *An úphill game* gives us the combination *up*+*hill* as a Compound. *He ran up hill* gives us the combination *up*+*hill* as two words. So it is with *down*+*hill*, *down*+*right*, and other words. *Man-servant*, *cock sparrow*, &c. &c. are Double or Compound as they are pronounced *mán-sérvant*, or *mán-servant*, *cóck-spárrow*, or *cóck-sparrow*.

The Fourth Class is hypothetical. I can, however, imagine that certain Compounds may, if used almost exclusively in Poetry, and with the Accent at *par*, become so accented even in the current language.

§ 237. For a remark on the words *peacock*, *peahen*, see *p.* 203, in the Chapter upon Gender. If these words be rendered Masculine or Feminine by the addition of the elements *-cock* and *-hen*, the statements made in the beginning of the present Chapter are invalidated. Since, if the word *pea-* be particularized, qualified, or defined by the words *-cock* and *-hen*, the Second term defines or particularizes the First, which is contrary to the Rule of *p.* 328. The truth, however, is that the words *-cock* and *-hen* are defined by the prefix *pea-*. Preparatory to the exhibition of this, let us remember that the word *pea* (although now found in Composition only) is a true and independent Substantive, the name of a species of fowl, like *pheasant*, *partridge*, or any other appellation. It is the Latin *Pavo*, German *Pfau*. Now, if the word *peacock* mean a *pea* (*Pfau* or *Pavo*) that is a Male, then do *woodcock*, *black-cock*, and *bantam-cock*, mean *woods*, *blacks*, and *bantams* that are Male. Or if the word *peahen* mean a *pea* (*Pfau* or

Pavo) that is Female, then do *moorhen* and *guinea-hen* mean *moors* and *guineas* that are Female. Again, if a *peahen* mean a *pea* (*Pfau* or *Pavo*) that is Female, then does the Compound *pheasant-hen* mean the same as *hen-pheasant;* which is not the case. The fact is that *peacock* means a *cock that is a pea* (*Pfau* or *Pavo*); *peahen* means a *hen that is a pea* (*Pfau* or *Pavo*); and, finally, *peafowl* means a *fowl that is a pea* (*Pfau* or *Pavo*). In the same way *moorfowl* means, not *a moor that is connected with a fowl,* but *a fowl that is connected with a moor.*

§ 238. The present Chapter closes with the notice of two Classes of words. They are mentioned now, not because they are Compounds, but because they can be treated of here more conveniently than elsewhere.

There are a number of words which are never found by themselves; or, if so found, have never the same sense that they have in Combination. Mark the word Combination. The terms in question are points of Combination, not of Composition: since they form not the parts of words, but the parts of phrases. Such are the expressions *time and tide — might and main — rede me my riddle — pay your shot — rhyme and reason,* &c. &c. &c. These words are evidently of the same Class, though not of the same species with *bishopric, colewort, spillikin, gossip, mainswearer,* and the words quoted in *p.* 337. These last-mentioned terms give us obsolete words preserved in Composition. The former give us obsolete words preserved in Combination.

§ 239. The other words are Etymological curiosities. They may occur in any language. The English, however, from the extent of its Classical element, is particularly abundant in them. It is a mere accident that they are all Compound words.

Let a word be introduced from a foreign language. Let it have some resemblance in form to an English word,

and let the meanings of the two words be not absolutely incompatible. We may then have a word of foreign origin taking the appearance of an English one. Such, amongst others, are *beef-eater*, from *bœuffetier; sparrow-grass*, from *asparagus; Shotover* (a hill in Oxfordshire), from *Chateau vert; Jerusalem artichoke*, from *Girasole*, &c. &c. Even these forms have their value in Etymology; since language is affected by false analogies as well as by true ones.

CHAPTER XXVI.

ON DERIVATION AND INFLECTION.

§ 240. DERIVATION, like *Etymology*, is a word used in a wide and in a limited sense. In the wide sense of the term every word, except it be in the simple form of a root, is a derived word. In this sense the Cases, Numbers, and Genders of Nouns, the Persons, Moods, and Tenses of Verbs, the Ordinal Numbers, the Diminutives, and even the Compound words, are alike matters of Derivation. In the wide sense of the term the word *fathers*, from *father*, is equally in a state of Derivation with the word *strength* from *strong*.

In the use of the word, even in its limited sense, there is considerable laxity and uncertainty.

Gender, *Number*, *Case*.—These have been called the *Accidents* of the Noun, and these it has been agreed to separate from Derivation in its stricter sense, or from Derivation properly so called, and to class together under the name of Declension. Nouns are Declined.

Person, *Number*, *Tense*, *Voice*.—These have been called the Accidents of a Verb, and these it has been agreed to separate from Derivation properly so called, and to class together under the name of Conjugation. Verbs are Conjugated.

Conjugation and Declension constitute Inflection. Nouns and Verbs, speaking generally, are Inflected.

Inflection, a part of Derivation in its wider sense, is separated from Derivation properly so called, or from Derivation in its limited sense.

The Degrees of Comparison, or certain Derived forms of Adjectives; the Ordinals, or certain Derived forms of the Numerals; the Diminutives, &c., or certain Derived forms of the Substantive, have been separated from Derivation properly so called. I am not certain, however, that for so doing there is any better reason than mere convenience. By some the Degrees of Comparison are considered as points of Inflection.

Derivation Proper, the subject of the present Chapter, comprises all the changes that words undergo, which are not referable to some of the preceding heads. As such, it is, in its details, a wider field than even Composition. The details, however, are not entered into.

§ 241. Derivation Proper may be divided according to a variety of principles. Amongst others,

I. *According to the Evidence.*—In the evidence that a word is not simple, but derived, there are at least two degrees.

A. That the word *strength* is a Derived word I collect to a certainty from the word *strong*, an independent form, which I can separate from it. Of the nature of the word *strength* there is the clearest evidence, or evidence of the First Degree.

B. *Fowl, hail, nail, sail, tail, soul;* in A. S. *fugel, hægel, nægel, segel, tægel, sawel.*—These words are by the best Grammarians considered as Derivatives. Now, with these words I can not do what was done with the word *strength*, I can not take from them the part which I look upon as the Derivational addition, and after that leave an independent word. *Strength – th* is a true word; *fowl* or *fugel – l* is no true word. If I believe these latter words to be Derivatives at all, I do it because I find in words like

handle, &c. &c., the *l* as a Derivational addition. Yet, as the fact of a word being sometimes used as a Derivational addition does not preclude it from being at other times a part of the root, the evidence that the words in question are not simple, but derived, is not cogent. In other words, it isevidence of the Second Degree.

II. *According to the Effect.*—The syllable *-en* in the word *whiten* changes the Noun *white* into a Verb. This is its effect. We may so classify as to arrange Combinations like *-en* (whose effect is to give the idea of the Verb) in one order; whilst Combinations like *-th* (whose effect is, as in the word *strength*, to give the idea of Abstraction) form another order.

III. *According to the Form.*—Sometimes the Derivational element is a Vowel (as the *ie* in *doggie*); sometimes a Consonant (as the *-th* in *strength*); sometimes a Vowel and Consonant combined, in other words, a syllable (as the *-en* in *whiten*); sometimes a change of Vowel without any addition (as the *i* in *tip*, compared with *top*); sometimes a change of Consonant without any addition (as the *z* in *prize*, compared with *price*). Sometimes it is a change of Accent, like *a súrvey*, compared with *to survéy* (see *pp.* 133, 262). To classify Derivatives in this manner is to classify them according to their Form. For the detail of the Derivative Forms, see D. G. ii. 89—405.

IV. *According to the historical origin of the Derivational Elements.*—For this see § 169, 3, *p.* 256, and also the Chapter upon Hybridism.

V. *According to the number of the Derivational Elements.*—In *fisher*, as compared with *fish*, there is but one Derivational Affix. In *fishery*, as compared with *fish*, the number of Derivational Elements is two.

§ 242. The list (taken from Walker) of words alluded to in *pp.* 133, 262, is as follows:

Nouns.	*Verbs.*	*Nouns.*	*Verbs.*
ábsent . . .	absént.	éxtract . . .	extráct.
ábstract . . .	abstráct.	férment . . .	fermént.
áccent . . .	accént.	fréquent . . .	frequént.
áffix	affíx.	ímport . . .	impórt.
áugment . .	augmént.	íncense . . .	incénse.
cólleague . .	colléague.	ínsult . . .	insúlt.
cómpact . .	compáct.	óbject . . .	objéct.
cómpound . .	compoúnd.	pérfume . . .	perfúme.
cómpress . .	compréss.	pérmit . . .	permít.
cóncert . . .	concért.	préfix . . .	prefíx.
cóncrete . .	concréte.	prémise . . .	premíse.
cónduct . . .	condúct.	présage . . .	preságe.
cónfine . . .	confíne.	présent . . .	presént.
cónflict . . .	conflíct.	próduce . . .	produce.
cónserve . . .	consérve.	próject . . .	projéct.
cónsort . . .	consórt.	prótest . . .	protést.
cóntract . . .	contráct.	rébel	rebél.
cóntrast . . .	contrást.	récord . . .	recórd.
cónverse . .	convérse.	réfuse . . .	refúse.
cónvert . . .	convért.	súbject . . .	subjéct.
désert . . .	desért.	súrvey . . .	survéy.
déscant . . .	descánt.	tórment . . .	torménT.
dígest . . .	digést.	tránsfer . . .	transfér.
éssay . . .	essáy.	tránsport . .	transport.
éxport . . .	expórt.		

§ 243. *Churl, earl, owl, fowl, hail, nail, sail, snail, tail, hazel, needle, soul, teazel, fair, beam, bottom, arm, team, worm, heaven, morn, dust, ghost, breast, rest, knight, spight, blind, hard, flax, fox, finch, stork,* &c. &c.—all these words, for certain Etymological reasons, are currently considered, by the latest Philologists, as Derivatives. Notwithstanding the general prevalence of a fuller form in the A. S., it is clear that, in respect to the evidence, they come under Division B.

§ 244. Forms like *tip* from *top*, *price* and *prize*, &c. &c., are of importance in General Etymology. Let it be received as a theory (as with some Philologists is really the case) that fragmentary sounds like the *-en* in *whiten*,

the *-th* in *strength*, &c. &c. were once *words*. Changing the expression, let it be considered that all Derivation was once Composition. Let this view be opposed. The first words that are brought to militate against it are those like *tip* and *prize*, where, instead of any *addition*, there is only *a change;* and, consequently, no vestiges of an older *word*. This argument, good as far as it goes, is rebutted in the following manner. Let the word *top* have attached to it a second word, in which second word there is a small Vowel. Let this small Vowel act upon the full one in *top*, changing it to *tip*. After this let the second word be ejected. We then get the form *tip* by the Law of Accommodation (see § 87), and not as an immediate sign of Derivation. The *i* in *chick* (from *cock*) may be thus accounted for; the *-en* in *chicken* being supposed to have exerted, first, an influence of Accommodation, and, afterwards, to have fallen off. The *i* in *chick* may, however, be accounted for by simpler processes. See *p.* 257.

This fact is alluded to in the notice of the Latin word *instituo*, *p.* 222.

§ 245. The word *ease* is pronounced *eaze*, whether it be a Substantive or a Verb. According to *p.* 263, this should not be the case. Apparently the pronunciation should be as follows:—*eace*, if a Noun; *eaze*, if a Verb. The word, however, is no exception to the analogies of *use* and *uze*, &c. &c.; since the *-s* is no part of the original word, but derived from the A. S. ð, as in *eað*, *eaðe* = *easy*, *easily*.

§ 246. In words like *bishopric*, and many others mentioned in the last Chapter, we had Compound words under the appearance of Derived ones; in words like *upmost* (see *p.* 246) and many others we have Derivation under the appearance of Composition.

CHAPTER XXVII.

ON HYBRIDISM AND THE INTRODUCTION OF NEW WORDS.

§ 247. UPON the present Chapter, §§ 34, 37, 40, 41, have an especial bearing. There it is stated that there is, in the English language, two elements; the first Gothic, the second Classical.

The Classical elements are introduced into our language in three ways; *viz.* from the Greek, direct; from the Latin, direct; from the Latin, through the medium of the Anglo-Norman.

It has been stated in § 41, that, although the *-et* in *lancet*, and the *-kin* in *lambkin*, have the same power, (that of Diminution,) such forms as *lamb-et* and *lance-kin* are inadmissible. The same is indicated in *p.* 257. The reason of this is, that *-et* is of Classical, and *lamb* of Gothic, *-kin* of Gothic, and *lance* of Classical origin. To tack on to a Gothic root a Classical termination, (and *vice versâ*,) is to be guilty of Hybridism.

Hybridism is a term derived from *hybrid-a, a mongrel;* a Latin word *of Greek extraction.*

§ 248. The terminations *-ize* (as in *criticize*), *-ism* (as in *criticism*), *-ic* (as in *comic*), these, amongst many others, are Greek terminations. To add them to words of other than of Greek origin is to be guilty of Hybridism.

The terminations *-ble* (as in *penetrable*), *-bility* (as in *penetrability*), *-al* (as in *parental*)—these, amongst many

others, are Latin terminations. To add them to words of other than of Latin origin is to be guilty of Hybridism. The words "*of Greek extraction*," used a few lines above, were written in Italics, for the sake of showing that the term Hybridism itself was ~~not~~ an instance of the fault complained of; the termination *-ism* being Greek, and the word *hybrid-* (in its *immediate* origin) Latin.

Hybridism is the commonest fault that accompanies the introduction of new words. The Hybrid additions to the English language are most numerous in works on Science.

It must not, however, be concealed that several well established words are Hybrid; and that, even in the writings of the Classical Roman authors, there is Hybridism between the Latin and the Greek.

I regret to find that the author of the Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences (in speaking of the additions that might be made to the Nomenclature of Science) almost neutralizes, by the doctrines of his preface, the just and truly philosophic views that are taken of Etymology in the body of the work.

§ 249. We are not at liberty to argue from the analogy of expressions like *witticism* and *tobacconist*, (hybrid words in current use,) in favour of fresh terms of the same sort. A refined train of Etymological criticism (too lengthy to be inserted here) can be adduced to prove, that all hybrid words that neither offend the scholar, and keep their place in language, come under certain conditions *peculiar to themselves*.

§ 250. The Etymological view of every word of foreign origin is, not that it is put together in England, but that it is brought whole from the language to which it is vernacular. Now no derived word can be brought whole from a language unless, in that language, all its parts exist. The word *penetrability* is not derived from the

English word *penetrable*, by the addition of *-ty*. It is the Latin word *penetrabilitas* imported. See *p.* 201, 7.

In Derived words all the parts must belong to one and the same language.—Such is the rule against Hybridism.

§ 251. A true word sometimes takes the appearance of a Hybrid without really being so. The *-icle*, in *icicle*, is apparently the same as the *-icle* in *radicle*. Now, as *ice* is Gothic, and *-icle* Classical, Hybridism is simulated. *Icicle*, however, is not a Derivative but a Compound; its parts being *is* and *gicel*, both A. S. words.

§ 252. *On Incompletion of the Radical.*—Let there be in a given language a series of roots ending in *-t*, as *sæmat*. Let a Euphonic influence eject the *-t*, as often as the word occurs in the Nominative Case. Let the Nominative Case be erroneously considered to represent the root, or radical, of the word. Let a Derivative word be formed accordingly, *i. e.* on the notion that the Nominative form and the Radical form coincide. Such a Derivative will exhibit only a part of the root; in other words, the Radical will be incomplete.

Now all this is what actually takes place in words like *hæmo-ptysis* (*spitting of blood*), *sema-phore* (*a sort of telegraph*). The Greek Imparasyllabics eject a part of the root in the Nominative Case; the Radical forms being *hæmat-* and *sæmat-*, not *hæm-* and *sæm-*.

Incompletion of the Radical is one of the commonest causes of words being coined faultily. It must not, however, be concealed, that even in the Classical writers, we have (in words like δίστομος) examples of Incompletion of the Radical.

The present Chapter, although scarcely embracing points of Etymology, has a natural place after the Chapter on Derivation. It is suggestive of principles, rather than exhaustive of detail.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ADVERBS AND UNINFLECTED PARTS OF SPEECH.

§ 253. *Adverbs.* — The Adverbs are capable of being classified after a variety of principles.

I. First, they may be divided according to their meaning. In this case we speak of the Adverbs of Time, Place, Number, Manner, &c. &c. This division is Logical rather than Etymological.

A division, however, which although Logical bears upon Etymology, is the following.

Well, better, ill, worse.—Here we have a Class of Adverbs expressive of degree, or intensity. Adverbs of this kind are capable of taking an Inflection, viz. that of the Comparative and Superlative degrees (see § 156).

Now, then, here, there.—In the idea expressed by these words there are no degrees of intensity. Adverbs of this kind are incapable of taking any Inflection.

Words like *better* and *worse* are Adjectives or Adverbs as they are joined to Nouns or Verbs.

Adverbs differ from Nouns and Verbs in being susceptible of one sort of Inflection only, viz. that of Degree. Prepositions, Conjunctions, Interjections, Affirmatives, and Negatives differ from Adverbs in being susceptible of no Inflection at all.

II. Secondly, Adverbs may be divided according to their

Form and Origin. This is truly an Etymological Classification.

Better, worse.—Here the combination of sounds equally gives an Adjective and an Adverb. *This book is better than that*—here *better* agrees with *book*, and is therefore Adjectival. *This looks better than that*—here *better* qualifies *looks*, and is therefore Adverbial. Again; *to do a thing with violence* is equivalent *to do a thing violently.* This shows how Adverbs may arise out of Cases. In words like the English *better*, the Latin *vi* = *violenter*, the Greek κάλον = κάλως, we have Adjectives in their Degrees, and Substantives in their Cases, with Adverbial powers. In other words, Nouns are Deflected from their natural sense to an Adverbial one. Adverbs of this kind are Adverbs of Deflection.

Brightly, bravely.—Here an Adjective is rendered Adverbial by the addition of the Derivative syllable *-ly.* Adverbs like *brightly*, &c. may (laxly speaking) be called Adverbs of Derivation.

Now.—This word has not satisfactorily been shown to have originated as any other Part of Speech but as an Adverb. The few words of this sort (*as, so, yet*) are Adverbs Absolute.

III. *When, now, well, worse, better* — here the Adverbial expression consists in a single word, and is *Simple. To-day, yesterday, not at all, somewhat* — here the Adverbial expression consists of a compound word, or a phrase. This indicates the division of Adverbs into Simple and Complex.

§ 254. The Adverbs of Deflection (of the chief importance in Etymology) may be arranged after a variety of principles. I. According to the Part of Speech from whence they originate. This is often an Adjective, often a Substantive, at times a Pronoun, occasionally a Preposition, rarely a Verb. II. According to the part of the

Inflection from whence they originate. This is often an Ablative Case, often a Neuter Accusative, often a Dative, occasionally a Genitive.

The following notices are miscellaneous rather than systematic.

Else, *unawares*, *eftsoons*.—These are the Genitive forms of Adjectives. *By rights* is a word of the same sort.

Once, *twice*, *thrice*. — These are the Genitive forms of Numerals.

Needs (as in *needs must go*) is the Genitive Case of a Substantive.

Seldom.—The old Dative (Singular or Plural) of the Adjective *seld*.

Whilom.—The Dative (Singular or Plural) of the Substantive *while*.

Little, *less*, *well*. — Neuter Accusatives of Adjectives. *Bright*, in the *sun shines bright*, is a word of the same class. The Neuter Accusative is a common source of Adverbs in all tongues.

Athwart.—A Neuter Accusative, and a word exhibiting the Norse Neuter in *-t*. See *pp.* 11. 14.

Where, *here*, *there*. — Feminine Datives of Pronouns. See § 151.

Than, *then*, *when*.—Masculine Accusatives of Pronouns. See § 151.

How, *why*. — Ablative or Instrumental Cases of Pronouns. See § 152.

Thence, *whence*, *hence*.—Secondary Genitives from *then*, *when*, *hin* (a Gothic form).—The nature of these words is obscured by the spelling. The O. E. is *thennes*, *whennes*. The same applies to *once*, *twice*, *thrice*.

Thither, *whither*, *hither*.—Comparative Forms. For the roots *hva*þ, þa*þ*, *hi*þ, see D. G. iii. 199.

§ 255. *Darkling*. — This is no Participle of a Verb

darkle, but an Adverb of Derivation, like *unwaringûn*, *unawares*, O. H. G.; *stillinge*, *secretly*, M. H. G.; *blindlings*, *blindly*, N. H. G.; *darnungo*, *secretly*, O. S.; *nichtinge*, *by night*, Middle Dutch; *blindeling*, *blindly*, New Dutch; *bæclinga*, *backwards*, *handlunga*, *hand to hand*, A. S.; and, finally, *blindlins*, *backlins*, *darklins*, *middlins*, *scantlins*, *stridelins*, *stowlins*, in Lowland Scotch.—D. G. iii. 236.

§ 256. "Adverbs like *brightly* may (*laxly speaking*) be "called Adverbs of Derivation." Such the assertion made a few paragraphs above. The first circumstance that strikes the reader is, that the termination *-ly* is common both to Adjectives and to Adverbs. This termination was once an independent word, *viz. leik* (see *p.* 336). Now as *-ly* sprung out of the A. S. *-lice*, and as words like *early*, *dearly*, &c. &c. &c., were originally *arlîce*, *deorlîce*, &c. &c., and as *arlîce*, *deorlîce*, &c. &c., were Adjectives, the Adverbs in *-ly* are (*strictly speaking*) Adverbs, not of Derivation, but of Deflection.

It is highly probable that not only the Adverbs of Derivation, but also the Absolute Adverbs, may eventually be reduced to Adverbs of Deflection. For *now* see D. G. iii. 249.

§ 257. *Prepositions.*—Prepositions, as such, are wholly unsusceptible of Inflexion. Other Parts of Speech, in a state of Inflexion, may be used with a Prepositional sense. This, however, is not an Inflexion of Prepositions.

No word is ever made a Preposition by the addition of a Derivational* element. If it were not for this, the practical classification of the Prepositions, in respect to

* *Over*, *under*, *after*.—These, although Derived forms, are not Prepositions of Derivation; since it is not by the affix *-er* that they are made Prepositions. *He went over*, *he went under*, *he went after* — these sentences prove the forms to be as much Adverbial as Prepositional. The word *practical* is inserted in the text on the strength of the remark at the end of § 256.

their form, would coincide with that of the Adverbs. As it is, there are only the Prepositions of Deflection, and the Absolute Prepositions. On the other principle of division there are the Simple Prepositions (*in*, *on*, &c.) and the Complex Prepositions (*upon*, *roundabout*, *across*).

The Prepositions of Deflection, when simple, originate chiefly in Adverbs, as *up*, *down*, *within*, *without*, unless, indeed, we change the assertion, and say that the words in point (and the others like them) are Adverbs originating in Prepositions. The absence of characteristic terminations renders these decisions difficult.

The Prepositions of Deflection, when complex, originate chiefly in Nouns, accompanied by an Absolute Preposition; as *instead of* of Substantival, *between* of Adjectival origin.

The Absolute Prepositions, in the English Language, are *in*, *on*, *of*, *at*, *up*, *by*, *to*, *for*, *from*, *till*, *with*, *through*.

§ 258. *Conjunctions.* — Conjunctions, like Prepositions, are wholly unsusceptible of Inflexion. Like Prepositions they are never made by means of a Derivational element. Like Prepositions they are either Simple (as *and*, *if*), or Complex (as *also*, *nevertheless*).

The Conjunctions of Deflection originate chiefly in Imperative Moods (as *all* save *one*, *all* except *one*); Participles used like the Ablative Absolute in Latin (as *all* saving *one*, *all* excepting *one*); Adverbs (as *so*); Prepositions (as *for*); and Relative Neuters (as *that*).

The Absolute Conjunctions in the English Language are *and*, *or*, *but*, *nor*? *if*.

§ 259. *Yes*, *no*.—Although *not* may be reduced to an Adverb, *nor* to a Conjunction, and *none* to a Noun, these two words (the direct Affirmative, and the direct Negative) are referable to none of the current Parts of Speech. Accurate Grammar places them in a Class by themselves.

§ 260. *Particles.*—The word Particle is a collective term for all those Parts of Speech that are *naturally* unsusceptible of Inflexion; comprising, 1. Interjections. 2. Direct Affirmatives. 3. Direct Negatives. 4. Absolute Conjunctions. 5. Absolute Prepositions. 6. Adverbs unsusceptible of Degrees of Comparison.

PART IV.

SYNTAX.

§ 261. To reduce a sentence to its elements, and to show that these elements are, 1, the Subject, 2, the Predicate, 3, the Copula;—to distinguish between Simple Terms and Complex Terms,—this is the department of Logic.

To show the difference, in force of expression, between such a sentence as *Great is Diana of the Ephesians*, and *Diana of the Ephesians is great*, wherein the natural order of the Subject and Predicate is reversed, is a matter of Rhetoric rather than a point of Syntax. To state, however, that it is the habit of the English language to place the Subject first, is truly a point of Syntax.

There is to me a father.—Here we have a circumlocution equivalent to *I have a father*. In the English language the circumlocution is unnatural. In the Latin it is common. To determine this is a matter of Idiom rather than of Syntax.

To state that such a sentence as *I speaks* is ungrammatical,—in other words, to exhibit the concordance of the Persons (and similarly of the Genders, &c.,)—is to treat a matter of General Grammar rather than a point of Syntax.

I am going.—To distinguish, in respect to meaning, these words from *I go*, is a question concerning the force

of words *irrespective of their collocation:* since *going*, as far as its meaning is concerned, is in the same predicament with an Adjective. The same applies to the determination of the force of Tenses. This is General Grammar rather than Syntax. *I shall move* differs from *I will move* as the ideas of *will* and *shall* differ from each other. To determine the ideas expressed by *will* and *shall* is a matter of Lexicography rather than of Syntax. *I have gone*, however, being in a different predicament from *I am going*, is, as seen below, truly a point of Syntax.

I am speaking, *I was reading.*—There was a stage in the Gothic languages when these forms were either inadmissible, or rare. Instead thereof we had the Present Tense, *I speak*, and the Past, *I spoke.* The same is the case with Classical languages in the Classical stage. To determine the difference in idea between these pairs of forms is a matter of Metaphysics. To determine at what period each idea came to have a separate mode of expression is matter of the *History* of language. For example, *vas láisands* appears in Ulphilas (Matth. vii. 29). There it appears as a rare form, and as a literal translation of the Greek ἦν διδασκών (*was teaching*). The Greek form itself was, however, an unclassical expression for ἐδίδασκε. In A. S. this mode of speaking became common, and in English it is commoner still. D. G. iv. 5.

In the following sections the peculiarities only of the English Syntax will be noted; the current information concerning Concord, Government, and the force of Tense and Case, being presumed.

§ 262. Concord, Government, and Collocation are the heads to which the greater part of the English Syntax is reducible. Subordinate to these we may arrange the points of English Syntax according to the Part of Speech affected. For instance, there is the Concord of Gender

between the Substantive and Adjective, the Concord of Person between the Substantive and Verb, &c. &c.

§ 263. The extent to which Rules of Syntax may operate, and the extent to which they may be violated, depends in a great measure upon the Etymology. In the English language the Masculine, Feminine, and Neuter Adjectives are identical forms. Hence there are, practically speaking, no rules for the Concord between the Substantive and Adjective. Such, however, is not the case with the Pronouns. Here we have the Genders, *he*, *her*, *it*, &c. &c. Hence arises the possibility of a False Concord.

§ 264. In the English, as in all other languages, a great number of expressions, scarcely warrantable in strict Syntax, become part and parcel of the language. To condemn these at once is unphilosophical. The better method is to account for them. The currency of an expression is *primâ facie* evidence of some grammatical reason existing for it. Clear notions concerning the following Figures of Speech explain the nature of many of our doubtful expressions.

§ 265. *Apposition.—Cæsar, the Roman Emperor, invades Britain.*—Here the words *Roman Emperor* explain, or define, the word *Cæsar;* and the sentence, filled up, might stand *Cæsar, that is, the Roman Emperor*, &c. &c. Again, the words *Roman Emperor* might be wholly ejected; or, if not ejected, they might be thrown into a Parenthesis. The practical bearing of this fact is exhibited by changing the sentence, and inserting the conjunction *and.* In this case, instead of one person, two are spoken of, and the Verb *invades* must be changed from the Singular to the Plural.

Now the words *Roman Emperor* are said to be in Apposition to *Cæsar.* They constitute, not an additional idea, but an explanation of the original one. They are,

as it were, *laid alongside* (*appositi*) *of* the word Cæsar. Cases of doubtful Number, wherein two Substantives precede a Verb, and wherein it is uncertain whether the Verb should be Singular or Plural, are decided by determining whether the Substantives be in Apposition or the contrary. No matter what the number of the Nouns may be, as long as it can be shown that they are in Apposition the Verb is in the Singular Number.

§ 266. *Collectiveness as opposed to Plurality.*—In sentences like *the meeting* was *large*, *the multitude* pursue *pleasure*, *meeting* and *multitude* are each Collective Nouns; that is, although they present the idea of a single object, that object consists of a Plurality of individuals. Hence, *pursue* is put in the Plural Number. To say, however, *the meeting were large* would sound improper. The Number of the Verb that shall accompany a Collective Noun depends upon whether the idea of the multiplicity of individuals, or that of the unity of the aggregate, shall predominate.

Sand and salt and a mass of iron is *easier to bear than a man without understanding.*—Let *sand and salt and mass of iron* be dealt with as a series of things the aggregate of which forms a mixture, and the expression is allowable.

The King and the Lords and Commons forms *an excellent frame of government.*—Here the expression is doubtful. Substitute *with* for the first *and*, and there is no doubt as to the propriety of the Singular form *is*.

§ 267. *Personification.*—The ideas of Apposition and Collectiveness accounted for the apparent violations of the Concord of Number. The idea of Personification applies to the Concord of Gender. A Masculine or Feminine Gender, characteristic of Persons, may be substituted for the Neuter Gender, characteristic of Things. In this case the term is said to be Personified.

The cities who aspired to liberty.—A Personification of the idea expressed by *cities* is here necessary to justify the expression.

It, the sign of the Neuter Gender, as applied to a Male or Female *child*, is the reverse of the process.

§ 268. *Ellipsis* (from the Greek *elleipein* = *to fall short*), or a *falling short*, occurs in sentences like *I sent to the bookseller's.* Here the word *shop* or *house* is understood. Expressions like *to go on all-fours*, and *to eat of the fruit of the tree*, are reducible to Ellipses.

§ 269. *Pleonasm* (from the Greek *pleonazein* = *to be in excess*) occurs in sentences like *the King, he reigns.* Here the word *he* is superabundant. In many *Pleonastic* expressions we may suppose an interruption of the sentence, and after that an abrupt renewal of it; as *the King—he reigns.*

The fact of the word *he* neither qualifying nor explaining the word *King*, distinguishes Pleonasm from Apposition.

Pleonasm, as far as the view above is applicable, is reduced to what is, apparently, its opposite, viz. Ellipsis.

My banks, they are furnished,—the most straitest sect,—these are Pleonastic expressions. In *the King, he reigns*, the word *King* is in the same predicament as in *the King, God bless him.*

The Double Negative, allowed in Greek and A. S., but not admissible in English, is Pleonastic.

The Verb *do*, in *I do speak*, is *not* Pleonastic. In respect to the sense it adds intensity. In respect to the construction it is not in Apposition, but in the same predicament with Verbs like *must* and *should* (as in *I must go*, &c. &c.); *i. e.* it is a Verb followed by an Infinitive. This we know from its power in those languages where the Infinitive has a characteristic sign; as, in German,

Die Augen *thaten* ihm winken.—GOETHE.

Besides this, *make* is similarly used in O. E.—*But men*

make draw the branch thereof, and beren him to be graffed at Babyloyne.—Sir J. Mandeville.

§ 270. *The figure Zeugma.—They wear a garment like that of the Scythians, but a language peculiar to themselves.*—The Verb, naturally applying to *garment* only, is here used to govern *language*. This is called, in Greek, *Zeugma* (Junction).

§ 271. *My paternal home was made desolate, and he himself was sacrificed.*—The sense of this is plain; *he* means *my father*. Yet no such Substantive as *father* has gone before. It is supplied, however, from the word *paternal*. The sense indicated by *paternal* gives us a Subject to which *he* can refer. In other words, the word *he* is understood, according to what is indicated, rather than according to what is expressed. This figure in Greek is called *pros to sæmainomenon* (*according to the thing indicated*).

The last-mentioned Figures of Speech are points of Rhetoric rather than of Syntax. For the appreciation of some apparent anomalies, the further exhibition of certain lines of criticism is necessary. These are truly points of Syntax.

§ 272. *The Reduction of Complex forms to Simple ones.*—Take, for instance, the current illustration, viz. *The-King-of-Saxony's army.*—Here the assertion is, not that the army belongs to *Saxony*, but that it belongs to the *King of Saxony;* which words must, for the sake of taking a true view of the construction, be dealt with as a single word in the Possessive Case. Here two Cases are dealt with as one; and a complex term is treated as a single word.

The same reasoning applies to phrases like the *two King Williams*. If we say the *two Kings William*, we must account for the phrase by Apposition.

§ 273. *True notion of the Part of Speech in use.*—In *he is gone*, the word *gone* must be considered as equivalent to *absent;* that is, as an Adjective. Otherwise the expression

is as incorrect as the expression *she is eloped.* Strong Participiples are Adjectival oftener than the Weak ones; their form being common to many Adjectives.

In *dy'ing dáy*, the Participle must be dealt with as an Adjective. The Idea is compound, but not the form (see *p.* 334).

True notion of the original Part of Speech.—In the phrase *I must speak*, the word *speak* is an Infinitive. In the phrase *I am forced to speak*, the word *speak* is (in the present English) an Infinitive also. In one case, however, it is preceded by *to;* whilst, in the other, the Particle *to* is absent. The reason for this lies in the original difference of form. *Speak — to* = the A. S. *sprécan*, an Infinitive; *to speak*, or *speak + to* = the A. S. *sprécanne*, a Gerund.

With these preliminaries we may notice the more prominent details of the English Syntax.

§ 274. *Concord of Gender.*—Except with the Pronouns, there is, in English, no room for violations of this Concord. Of these, all connected with the word *which* are apparent rather than real. For the use of this word in the Lord's Prayer (where it agrees with *Father*), no licence of language need be assumed or excused. From p. 231 we learn that the word is (etymologically speaking) of no Gender.

The worst men that could be found.—In phrases like this we must deal with *that* as an undeclined form common to all Genders, Numbers, and Cases.

§ 275. *The Concords of Number.*—These are in English of considerable importance. The apparent anomalies are chiefly to be considered either as points of Collectiveness, or as points of Apposition.

§ 276. *It is they that are the real authors of the revolution.* —*It*, in the Sing., is here followed by *they are* in the Plural. The reason of this is explained by the analysis of the sentence. *The real authors of the revolution*—this is the Sub-

ject. *They*—this is the Predicate. The Copula must evidently be *are*=*The real authors of the revolution are* Subject.

they; or, *they that are the real authors of the revolution* Cop. Pred.
are they. Notwithstanding this, we have *it*, instead of *they.* The reason of this is that *it* represents the Subject.

§ 277. If this use of *it* be correct, the sentence, *there* is *men who never reason*, is correct also; since *there* has the same power with *it;* viz. it represents the Subject. The Subject.

sentence, reconstructed, is as follows—*men that never reason* Cop. Pred.
are there. Still the expression *there is men* (although defended) is equivocal.

Now if *it is men* be correct, *there is men* is correct also; and if *there are men* be correct, *it are men* is correct also. Which position are we to argue from?

Contrary to the current opinion, I believe that *it are men* is (taken by itself) more in accordance with the nature of language than *there is men;* since, in A. S. and Modern German, we have actually forms equivalent to *it are, viz.* *þæ't sind*, A. S.; *es sind*, German.

In sense *it* is adverbial. This may be seen by comparing its power with that of *there.* Adverbial, however, as it is in its power, its form is that of a Singular Pronoun. Hence its effect upon the Verb. *There*, carrying with it the form of one Number no more than of another, is less stringent in its influence on the Verb.

§ 278. 1. *Either you or I* are *in fault.*—2. *Either you or I* is *in fault.*—3. *Neither you nor I* are *in fault.*—4. *Neither you nor I* is *in fault.*—The words *either* and *neither* are in different conditions. In predicating something concerning *neither you nor I*, a negative assertion is made concerning *both.* In predicating something concerning *either you or I*,

a positive assertion is made concerning *one of the two.* This indicates that *neither* should take a Plural, *either* a Singular Verb; in other words, that the sentences marked 2 and 3 are the only ones logically correct.

Either, however, is used with a latitude of sense. In the sentence above it is exclusive; that is, it asserts something of *one of two*, to the exclusion of the other, the sense being, *if you are not in fault, I am*, and *vice versâ*. In other senses it expresses indifference; *either of us* meaning *both of us*, and *either side* meaning *both sides.* It being a matter of indifference concerning which out of two things we make an assertion, we may make it of each equally, or of both. In this latitude of sense lies the cause of the latitude of Concord.

§ 279. *Alms, Riches.* — Etymology (*p.* 209) is most decidedly in favour of these words being dealt with as Singulars. The practice, however, of the language traverses it.

Physics, Mathematics, &c. &c. — Naturally Collective in their signification, and consequently requiring a Singular Verb. They are capable, however, of taking a Plural meaning. See *p.* 209.

This means is good.—The original word is *moyen*, so that the *-s* in *means* has its existence only so far as it denotes a Plural Number. The form *this means* is invalidated by the Etymology. The Etymology, however, is traversed by the form *a means.* The same reasoning applies to the word *amends*, from *amende*, Fr., and *pains*, from *peine*, Fr. *News* is in a different predicament. It is less Singular and more Collective. Besides this, the French form ends in *-s*, *nouvelles.*

The arguments were as follows. — The way of justifying this expression is to deal with *as follows* as an Adverb.

I have not travelled this twenty years. — Justified by dealing with *twenty years* as a Collective Substantive. *A million of men* is a similar expression. Phrases like *these kind*

of people—those sort of goods, to be defended, must be reduced to the idea of Collectiveness, and then it must be shown that the idea of the Multiplicity of Individuals predominates over that of the Unity of the Aggregate. See § 226. *A hundred head of oxen, ten sail of the line*, are similar expressions.

§ 280. *Concord of Person.*)—The use of *you are* for (except amongst Quakers) *thou art*. Throughout the generality of languages the use of the Second Person Singular is avoided. In German and Scandinavian an expression equivalent to *they are* is the current one; as *Sie sind*, G.; *De ere*, D.

§ 281. *Meseems, methinks, me listeth.* — See § 216. In sentences like *as far as regards me*, we have an equal absence of the Pronoun *it*. Taken by itself, however, the word *regards* requires a Pronoun. This divides it from the true Impersonals.

§ 282. *Self.* — See *p.* 230. Of these words, *myself, thyself, ourselves*, and *yourselves* are in a state of Government; *himself, themselves*, are in a state of Apposition; whilst *itself* is equivocal.

To say *myself am weak* is as incorrect as to say *my body am weak*, or *my individuality am weak*. The origin of the expression lies in the fact of *I myself* being so much the commoner expression.

Observe the accent *mysélf, themsélves*. This indicates that the words are Two, not Compound. See *p.* 331.

§ 283. *Concord of Case.* — Violated in expressions like *at Smith's the bookseller*, instead of *Smith's the bookseller's*; since words in Apposition are properly in the same Case.

§ 284. *Government.* — In English, where, with the exception of the Pronouns, there are no forms except those of the Nominative and Genitive (or Possessive), there is little room for rules concerning Government.

By rights, however, an expression rarely used in writing, is peculiar. *Ráitis*, M. G.; *rëhtes*, M. H. G., are Genitive Cases used Adverbially. They are, moreover, the Genitive Cases of Adjectives. Now, if such be the origin of the Noun in *by rights*, the Preposition *by* governs a Case which it governs no where else. *Tô* in A. S. is, in Adverbial expressions, occasionally found before a Genitive; as *tô middes* = *in the midst.*

§ 285. *Give it him* and *whom shall I give it.* — Allowable, instead of *give it to him* and *whom shall I give it to*, on the score of the original Dative nature of the forms in *-m.* See *p.* 218.

§ 286. *Than.*—In and of itself *than* governs no case. *I like this better than that* = *I like this better than I like that;* whilst *he likes you better than I* = *he likes you better than I like you.* In the first of these cases an Accusative, in the second a Nominative follows *than.* Which of the two cases be used depends upon the relation that they would bear to the Verb if the sentence was filled up, and the Verb repeated.

——— Satan than whom
None higher sat—P. L.

is a laxity of language. *Than* is derivable from *then.* In (amongst others) the writings of James I, we always find the form *then;* as *this is better then that. Then* expresses Succession in Time; *than*, Succession in Degree. For the original nature of them see *p.* 228.

In like manner *than* is, in O. E., found instead of *then;* just as *whan* is for *when.*

§ 287. *I have written.*—It was remarked in *p.* 357, that, although the Combination *I am going* was scarcely a point of Syntax, the Combination *I have gone* was such. As this difference is best explained by reference to a Transitive Verb, the word *written* is here used for the sake of illus-

trating it. In *it is written* the Participle is in a state of Concord. In *I have written* it is in a state of Government. It is an Accusative Case; at least it has the sense of such. Corresponding to this, *have* is (its origin being considered) a Transitive Verb. *I have written*, in respect to its Syntax, is neither more nor less than *I possess as a writing*. In Latin it would be rendered *scriptum habeo*, and not *scriptus habeo*. In Greek it coincides with ἔχω γεγραμμένον, and not with ἔχω γράψας. Deflected from its Transitive sense it became Auxiliary, and Intransitive.

The proofs of the original Transitive nature of *have* lie in the following facts.

1. The use of *eigan* = *to own*, or *possess*, with a similar force in O. H. G.

2. The similar use of *avere*, *avoir*, &c. from *habeo* in the languages derived from the Latin.

3. The use of *tengo*, from the Latin *teneo*, in Spanish.

The date of the use of the root *hab-*, with this power, is equally early in the Gothic and in the Classical languages; being found in the earliest O. H. G. and in the earliest Provençal. It occurs also in A. S.; as *æ'nne hæfde he swá swiðne gewohrtne* = *one he had made so strong*.—Rask, § 401.

To those who translate the opening of Catiline's speech *I have discovered*, rather than *I am in possession of the discovery*, this use of *habeo* dates from the time of Sallust—*Compertum habeo, milites, verba viris virtutem non addere*.—B. C. Similarly—*quæ cum ita sint, de Cæsare satis hoc tempore dictum habeo*.—Phil. v.

§ 288. *Collocation*.—In sentences like *Solomon, the son of David, who built the temple*.—The rule that, where two Antecedents are followed by a single Relative, the Relative applies to the last, is of stringent importance in English. The sentence above violates it. The want of Pronominal

Inflections makes the adherence to this imperative. Accurately speaking, it is a matter of Rhetoric rather than of Syntax.

Quoth he.—The peculiarity of this form is noticed in § 213.

§ 289. *Power of Cases.*—In the way of Syntax it is convenient to call the Genitive form *Possessive.* By the Genitive form is meant the form in *'s.* In *the man's hand,* one of two meanings is conveyed; *viz.* either that of *the hand a part of the man,* or else that of *the hand in the possession of the man.* This gives, for the Genitive form, a Partitive power and a Possessive power.

Directly or indirectly, I conceive that all phrases wherein either the Preposition *of* or the termination *'s* occur, are either Partitive or Possessive; although in many instances it is difficult to determine which power preponderates.

As often, however, as one of the two meanings is, decidedly, the one paramount, the following rule holds good. If the notion be Partitive, it is right to use the Preposition *of;* if Possessive, the Genitive form.

This explains the difference between *a picture of me* and *my picture.*

A further rule is, that the Genitive (Possessive) form precedes the Substantive with which it is joined; as *the man's son,* instead of the *son man's.*

In phrases like *a picture of John's,* the sentence is Elliptical; being, in full, *a picture of John's pictures.* Here the *of* is Partitive, the *'s* Possessive.

§ 290. *Case Absolute.*—"*He made as wise and true pro-*" *verbs as anybody else has done since,* him *only excepted who,*" &c. &c. I see no reason for this use of *him* being considered incorrect. The Case is what the Latins call Absolute. There are no grounds for the assertion that the Absolute Case in English is the Nominative. It may quite as truly

be said to be the Ablative, since there is an equal absence of Inflection in both. In the Pronouns, there *is* an oblique Case to be made Absolute, and the A. S. shows that this Case Absolute was either a Dative or one allied to the Dative.—*Up-a-sprungenre sunnan = orto sole.*—Rask, § 381.

§ 291. *This is the greater.*—Here a Comparative is used for a Superlative, and there is a latitude in the use of the Degrees. Phrases like *the more the merrier*, differ from this. In A. S. occurs þý, an Ablative form of the Demonstrative Pronoun, and different from the undeclined þe (the origin of the English Article). In O. E. we have *for* þi = *quapropter*. This fact puts expressions like *the more* in the condition of the Latin *eo magis*.

§ 292. *He walked the horse.*—This is not an Intransitive used as a Transitive Verb, but a proof that one and the same word may mean *to walk* and *to make to walk*.

§ 293. *I beat you if you do so and so.*—Here the Present is used for the Future. Generally it is, when so used, strongly accented. This fact has a bearing in general Etymology, which we appreciate in considering the Future forms of Greek words like νέμω and νεμῶ.

§ 294. *Is given.*—Now used with a Present sense = *datur*. In A. S. it corresponded with the Latin *datus est;* having a Perfect power. The Present was expressed by *weorðan, to become;* as *wyrð gifen = datur, is gifen = datus est.*—D. G. iv. 19. This is a point of History rather than of Syntax.

§ 295. *Beón*, as stated in *p.* 321, had, in A. S., a Future power; as *beó funden = invenietur, beó gefylled = implebitur.*—D. G. iv. 18. In the idea of Futurity lies the idea of contingency. From the idea of contingency arises the present Subjunctive power of *be*.

In this fact lies the proper use of the Subjunctive Mood. To write *be* instead of *is* or *am*, there must be the idea of

contingency. As often, moreover, as *be* must be used for *am* or *is*, the Subjunctive form like *speak*, must be used for the Indicative form *speaks* (*he speaks, if he speak*).

§ 296. The two following points are matters of Orthography rather than of Syntax.

A or *an* before *u*.—The letter *u*, wherever it is sounded *yoo*, is virtually a Consonant. Hence, even if we write *an useful*, we say *a yooseful*. The same applies to the combination *eu*. Whatever we may write, we *pronounce* the Article as *a*, as often as *eu* = *yoo*.

It's my book, and *'tis my book*.—Each of these expressions is correct. In the first, it is the *is*, in the second, it is the *it* that is abbreviated. The right spelling is *it's*, and *'t is*, respectively.

END OF PART IV.

PART V.

ON THE PROSODY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

---

§ 297. Prosody deals with Metre; and with Accent, Quantity, and the Articulate Sounds, as subordinate to Metre. For these the reader is referred to Part II. Chapters I. VI. VII.

Metre is a general term for the recurrence, within certain intervals, of syllables similarly affected.

Syllables may be similarly affected; 1, in respect to their Quantities; 2, in respect to their Accents; 3, in respect to their Articulations.

1.

Pălai kўnāgĕtoūntă kai mĕtroūmĕnōn.
Πάλαι κύνηγέτοῦντά καὶ μέτροῦμένον.—Soph. *Ajax*, 3.

Here there is the recurrence of similar Quantities.

2.

The wáy was lóng, the wínd was cóld.—
Lay of the Last Minstrel.

Here there is the recurrence of similar Accents.

3.

The way was long, the wind was *cold*,
The minstrel was infirm and *old*.—*Ditto.*

Here (besides the recurrence of similar Accents) there is a recurrence of the same Articulate Sounds; *viz.* of *o* + *ld*.

In the *general* view of Metre it is a matter of indiffer-

ence whether the recurrence of similar Articulations take place at the end or at the beginning of words: as

> þá *wæ*'s æfter *wi*ste
> *Wó*p up-a-hafen.—BEOWULF, 2, 17.

This is a specimen of Anglo-Saxon Metre, wherein the rule is that certain *initial* Articulations should recur within certain intervals.

All Metre goes by the name of Poetry, although all Poetry is not Metrical. The Hebrew Poetry (*see* Lowth *De Sacra Poesi Hæbræorum*) is characterized by the recurrence of similar *ideas*.

§ 298. The Metres of the Classical Languages consist *essentially* in the recurrence of similar Quantities; Accent also playing a part. The incompatibility of the Classical Metres with the English Prosody lies in the fact (stated at *p.* 130), *that the Classic writer measures Quantity by the Length of the Syllable taken altogether, whilst the Englishman measures it by the Length of the Vowel alone.*

§ 299. The English Metres consist essentially of the recurrence of similar Accents; the recurrence of similar Articulations being sometimes (as in all rhyming poetry) superadded.

The A. S. Metres consist in the recurrence of certain similar *initial* Articulations; the Accent playing a part.

§ 300. *Alliterative Metres.*—The Metres last mentioned are called *Alliterative*. The rule is that, within a certain interval, three Accented Syllables shall begin with the same letter.

> In *C*aines cynne
> þone cwealm gewræ'c—&c. &c.

This is the Metre of the Old Gothic languages generally. For the details of Alliteration, see Rask's A. S. Grammar, Part V. Guest's English Rhythms.

In the specimen of Alliteration just given the only Articulation that recurred was the letter *c*. It is very evident that the *two*, the *three*, or the *four* first letters, or even the whole syllable, might have coincided. Such is the case with the following lines from Lord Byron.

> Already doubled is the cape, the bay
> Receives the *prow*, that *proudly spurns* the *spray*.

Alliteration, as an ornament, must be distinguished from Alliteration as the essential character of Metre. Alliteration, as an ornament, is liable to many varieties.

§ 301. *Rhyme.*—In *English* versification, *Rhyme* is, next to Accent, the most important element. The true nature of a Rhyme may best be exhibited after the Analysis of a Syllable, and the exhibition of certain recurrent combinations, that look like Rhymes, without being so.

Let the syllable *told* be taken to pieces. For metrical purposes it consists of three parts or elements: 1, the Vowel (*o*); 2, the part preceding the Vowel (*t*); 3, the part following the Vowel (*ld*). The same may be done with the word *bold*. The two words can now be compared with each other. The comparison shows that the Vowel is in each the same (*o*); that the part following the Vowel (*ld*) is the same; and, finally, that the part preceding the Vowel is *different* (*t* and *b*). This difference between the part preceding the Vowel is essential.

Told, compared with itself (*told*), is no Rhyme, but an *homœoteleuton* (ὁμοῖος, *homoios* = *like*, and τελεύτη, *teleutæ* = *end*,) or *like ending*. It differs from a Rhyme in having the parts preceding the Vowel alike. Absolute identity of termination is not recognized in English poetry, except so far as it is mistaken for Rhyme.

> The soft-flowing outline that steals from the *eye*,
> Who threw o'er the surface? did you or did *I*?
>
> WHITEHEAD.

Here the difference in spelling simulates a difference in sound, and an *homœoteleuton* takes the appearance of a rhyme.

Bold and *note.*—As compared with each other, these words have two of the elements of a Rhyme; *viz.* the identity of the Vowel, and the difference of the parts preceding it. They want, however, the third essential; or the identity of the parts following; *ld* being different from *t*. The coincidence, however, as far as it goes, constitutes a point in Metre. The words in question are Assonances; and, because the identity lies in the *vowels*, they may be named Vowel Assonances. Vowel Assonances are recognized in (amongst others) the Spanish and Scandinavian metrical systems. In English they occur only when they pass as Rhymes.

Bold and *mild.*—Here also are two of the elements of a Rhyme, viz. the identity of the parts following the Vowel (*ld*), and the difference of the parts preceding (*b* and *m*). The identity of the Vowel (*o* being different from *i*) is, however, wanting. The words in question are Assonances, and Consonantal Assonances. Recognized in the Scandinavian, they occur in English only when they pass as Rhymes.

Rhymes may consist of a single syllable, as *told, bold;* of two syllables, as *water, daughter;* of three, as *cheerily, wearily.* Now the Rhyme begins where the dissimilarity of parts immediately before the main Vowel begins. Then follows the Vowel; and, lastly, the parts after the Vowel. All the parts after the Vowel must be absolutely identical. Mere similarity is insufficient.

Then come ere a *minute's* gone,
For the long summer day
Puts its wings, swift as *linnets'* on,
For flying away.—CLARE.*

* Quoted from Guest's English Rhythms.

In the lines just quoted there is no Rhyme, but an Assonance. The identity of the parts after the main syllable is destroyed by the single sound of *g* in *gone*.

A Rhyme, to be perfect, must fall on syllables equally accented.—To make *sky* and the last syllable of merri*ly* serve as Rhymes, is to couple an accented syllable with an unaccented one.

A Rhyme, to be perfect, must fall upon syllables absolutely accented.—To make the last syllables of words like fligh*ty* and merri*ly* serve as rhymes, is to couple together two unaccented syllables.

Hence there may be (as in the case of blank verse) Accent without Rhyme; but there cannot be Rhyme without Accent.

A Rhyme consists in the combination of like and unlike *sounds*.—Words like *I* and *eye* (*Homœoteleuta*), *ease* and *cease* (Vowel Assonances), *love* and *grove* (Consonantal Assonances), are Printers' Rhymes; or mere combinations of like and unlike letters.

A Rhyme, moreover, consists in the combination of like and unlike *articulate* sounds.—*Hit* and *it* are not Rhymes, but identical endings; the *h* being no articulation. To my ear, at least, the pair of words, *hit* and *it*, comes under a different class from the pair *hit* (or *it*) and *pit*.

§ 302. A full and perfect Rhyme (the term being stringently defined) consists in *the recurrence of final syllables equally and absolutely accented, wherein the vowel and the part following the vowel shall be identical, whilst the part preceding the vowel shall be different. It is also necessary that the part preceding the vowel be articulate.**

* To the definition in the text, words like *old* and *bold* form no exception. At the first view it may be objected that in words like *old* there is no part preceding the vowel. Compared, however, with *bold*, the negation of that part constitutes a difference. The same applies to words like *go* and *lo*, where the negation of a part following the vowel is a point

The deviations from the above-given Rule, so common in the Poetry of all languages, constitute, not Rhymes, but Assonances, &c. &c. that, by poetic licence, are recognized as equivalents to Rhymes.

§ 303. *Measure.*—In lines like the following, the Accent occurs on every second syllable; in other words, every accented syllable is accompanied by an unaccented one.

The wáy was lóng, the wínd was cóld.

This accented syllable and its accompanying unaccented one constitute a *Measure.* The number of the syllables being two, the Measure in question is Dissyllabic.

§ 304. In lines like the following the Accent falls on every third syllable, so that the number of syllables to the Measure is three, and the Measure is Trisyllabic.

At the clóse of the dáy when the hámlet is stíll.—BEATTIE.

The primary division of the English Measures is into the Dissyllabic and the Trisyllabic.

§ 305. *Dissyllabic Measures.*—The words *týrant* and *presúme* are equally Dissyllabic Measures; in one, however, the Accent falls on the first, in the other on the second syllable. This leads us to a farther division of the English Measures.

A Measure like *presúme* (where the Accent lies on the second syllable) may be repeated throughout a whole verse, or a whole series of verses; as,

Then fáre thee wéll mine ówn dear lóve;
The wórld has nów for ús
No gréater gríef, no pain abóve,
The páin of párting thus.—MOORE.

---

of identity. Furthermore, I may observe, that the word *part* is used in the Singular Number. The assertion is not that every individual sound preceding the vowel must be different, but that the aggregate of them must be so. Hence, *pray* and *bray* (where the *r* is common to both forms) form as true a Rhyme as *bray* and *play*, where all the sounds preceding *a*, differ.

Here the Accent falls on the second syllable of the Measure.

A Measure like *týrant* (where the Accent lies on the first syllable) may be repeated throughout a whole verse, or a whole series of verses; as,

Héed! O héed, my fátal stóry;
I' am Hósier's ínjured ghóst;
Cóme to séek for fáme and glóry,
Fór the glóry I' have lóst.—GLOVER.

The number of Dissyllabic Measures is, of necessity, limited to two.

§ 306. *Trisyllabic Measures.*—The words *mérrily*, *disáble*, *cavaliér*, are equally Trisyllabic, but not similarly accented. Each constitutes a separate measure, which may be continued through a whole verse, or a whole series of verses; as,

1.

Mérrily, mérrily, sháll I live nów,
U'nder the blóssom that hángs on the bóugh.
Tempest.

2.

But váinly thou wárrest;
For thís is alóne in
Thy pówer to decláre:
That ín the dim fórest
Thou heárd'st a low moáning,
And sáw'st a bright lády surpássingly faír.
Christabel.

3.

There 's a beáuty for éver unfádingly bríght;
Like the lóng ruddy lápse of a súmmer-day's níght.
Lalla Rookh.

The number of Trisyllabic Measures is, of necessity, limited to three.

§ 307. The nature of Measures may, as we have already seen, be determined by the proportion of the Accented and

Unaccented syllables. It may also be determined by the proportion of the Long and Short syllables. In the one case we measure by the Accent, in the other by the Quantity. Measures determined by the Quantity are called *feet.* The word *foot* being thus defined, we have no *feet* in the English Metres; since in English we determine our Measures by Accent only.

The Classical Grammarians express their feet by symbols; ¯ denoting Length, ˘ Shortness. Forms like ¯¯, ¯˘, ¯˘˘, ˘¯¯, ˘˘¯, &c. are the symbolical representations of the Classical feet.

The Classical Grammarians have names for their feet; *e. g.*, *Iambic* is the name of ˘¯, *Trochee* of ¯˘, *Dactyle* of ¯˘˘ *Amphibrachys* of ˘¯˘, *Anapæst* of ˘˘¯, &c. &c.

The English Grammarians have no symbols for their feet; since they have no form for expressing the absence of the accent. Sometimes, they borrow the Classical forms ˘ and ¯. These, however, being meant for the expression of Quantity, confusion arises from the use of them.

Neither have the English Grammarians names for their measures. Sometimes, they borrow the Classical terms *iambic*, *trochee*, &c. &c. These, however, being meant for the expression of Quantity, confusion arises from the use of them.

As symbols for the English Measures, I indicate the use of *a* as denoting an accented, *x* an unaccented syllable; or else that of + as denoting an accented, – an unaccented syllable. Finally, ′ may denote the accent, ·· the absence of it.

As names for the English Measures I have nothing to offer. At times it is convenient to suppose that they have a definite order of arrangement, and to call words like *týrant* the *first* measure, and words like *presúme* the second measure. In like manner, *mérrily* is Measure 3; *disáble*, 4; and *cavalíer*, 5. As the number of Measures is (from

the necessity of the case) limited, this can be done conveniently. The Classical names are never used with impunity. Their adoption invariably engenders confusion. It is very true that, *mutatis mutandis*, (*i. e.* Accent being substituted for Quantity,) words like *týrant* and *presúme* are Trochees and Iambics; but it is also true that, with a common nomenclature, the full extent of the change is rarely appreciated.

Symbolically expressed, the following forms denote the following measures:

1. + — , or ′ ·· , or *a x* = *ty′rant*.
2. — + , or ·· ′ , or *x a* = *presúme*.
3. + — —, or ′ ·· ··, or *a x x* = *mérrily*.
4. — + —, or ·· ′ ··, or *x a x* = *disáble*.
5. — — +, or ···· ′, or *x x a* = *cavaliér*.

On these measures the following general assertions may be made; *viz.*

That the Dissyllabic Measures are, in English, commoner than the Trisyllabic.

That, of the Dissyllabic Measures, the Second is commoner than the First.

That, of the Trisyllabic Measures, No. 3 is the least common.

That, however much one measure may predominate in a series of verses, it is rarely unmixed with others. In

> *Ty′rants* swim sáfest ín a púrple floód—
>
> MARLOWE.

the measure *a x* appears in the place of *x a*. This is but a single example of a very general fact, and of a subject liable to a multiplicity of rules.

§ 308. Grouped together according to certain rules, Measures constitute Lines or Verses; and, grouped together according to certain rules, Lines constitute Couplets, Triplets, Stanzas, &c. &c.

The absence or the presence of Rhyme constitutes Blank Verse, or Rhyming Verse.

The succession, or periodic return, of Rhymes constitutes Stanzas, or Continuous Metre, as the case may be.

The quantity of Rhymes in succession constitutes Couplets, or Triplets.

The quantity of *Accents* in a line constitutes the nature of the verse taken by itself.

The succession, or periodic return, of Verses of the same length has the same effect with the succession, or periodic return, of Rhymes; *viz.* it constitutes Stanzas, or Continuous Metre, as the case may be.

This leads to the Nomenclature of the English Metres. Of these, none in any of the Trisyllabic Measures have recognized and technical names; neither have any that are referable to the Measure *a x*.

§ 309. Taking, however, those that are named, we have the following list of terms.

1. *Octosyllabics.* — Four Measures *x a*, and (unless the Rhyme be double) eight syllables. Common in Sir W. Scott's poetry.

> The way was long, the wind was cold.
>
> *Lay of the Last Minstrel.*

2. *Heroics.*—Five Measures *x a*. This is the common measure in Narrative and Didactic Poetry.

> To err is human, to forgive divine.

3. *Alexandrines.*—Six Measures *x a*. This name is said to be taken from the early romances on the deeds of Alexander the Great.

> He lifted up his hand | that back againe did start.—SPENSER.

4. *Service Metre.*—Seven Measures *x a*. This is the common Metre of the Psalm-versions. Thence its name.

But one request I make to him | that sits the skies above,
That I were freely out of debt | as I were out of love.

SIR JOHN SUCKLING.

§ 310. Such the names of certain Lines or Verses, taken by themselves. Combined, or divided, they form

1. *Heroic Couplets.* — Heroics, in Rhyming Couplets, successive.

'Tis hard to say if greater want of skill
Appear in writing or in judging ill.

Essay on Criticism.

The Heroic Couplet is called also *Riding Rhyme;* it being the metre wherein Chaucer's Canterbury Tales (told by a party riding to Canterbury) are chiefly written.

2. *Heroic Triplets.*—Same as the preceding, except that three rhymes come in succession.

3. *Blank Verse.*—Heroics without rhyme.

4. *Elegiacs.*—The metre of Gray's Elegy. Heroics in four-line stanzas with alternate rhymes.

5. *Rhyme Royal.*—Seven lines of Heroics, with the two last rhymes successive, and the five first recurring at intervals. Sometimes the last line is an Alexandrine. There are varieties in this metre according to the intervals of the five first rhymes:

This Troilus in gift of curtesie
With hauke on hond, and with a huge rout
Of knights, rode and did her companie
Passing all the valey far without,
And ferther would have ridden out of doubt,
Full faine, and wo was him to gone so sone,
But tourne he must, and it was eke to doen.

CHAUCER'S *Troilus.*

6. *Ottava Rima.*—The metre in Italian for Narrative Poetry. Eight lines of Heroics; the six first rhyming alternately, the two last in succession.—Byron's Don Juan in English, Orlando Furioso, &c. &c. in Italian.

7. *Spenserian Stanza.*—Eight lines of Heroics closed by an Alexandrine. There are varieties in this metre according to the interval of the rhymes.

8. *Terza Rima.*—Taken from the Italian, where it is the metre of Dante's Divina Commedia. Heroics with *three* rhymes recurring at intervals.—Lord Byron's Prophecy of Dante.

9. *Poulterer's Measure.*—Alexandrines and Service Measures alternately. Found in the poetry of Henry the Eighth's time.

10. *Ballad Metre.*—Stanzas of four lines; the first and third having four, the second and fourth having three measures each. Rhymes alternate.

> Turn, gentle hermit of the dale,
> And guide thy lonely way,
> To where yon taper cheers the vale
> With hospitable ray.
>
> *Edwin and Angelina.*

§ 311. *Scansion.*—Let the stanza just quoted be read as two lines, and it will be seen that a couplet of Ballad Metre is equivalent to a line of Service Metre. Such, indeed, was the origin of the Ballad Metre. Observe also the pause (marked |) both in the Alexandrine and the Service Metre. This indicates a question as to where lines *end;* in other words, how we can distinguish one long line from two short ones.

It may, perhaps, partake of the nature of a metrical fiction to consider that (in all rhyming poetry) the length of the Verse is determined by the occurrence of the Rhyme. Nevertheless, as the matter cannot be left to the printer only, and as some definition is requisite, the one in point is attended by as few inconveniences as any other. It must not, however, be concealed that lines as short as

> It screamed and growled, | and cracked and howled—

it treats as *two;* and that lines as long as

> Where Virtue wants and Vice abounds,
> And Wealth is but a baited hook—

it reduces to a single verse.

§ 312. In Metres of Measure $a\,x$, the number of Syllables is double the number of Accents, unless the final Rhyme be single; in which case the Syllables are the fewest.

In Metres of Measure $x\,a$, the number of Syllables is double the number of Accents, unless the Rhyme be double (or treble); in which case the Syllables are the most numerous.

Now this view (which may be carried throughout the whole five measures) of the proportion between the Accents and the Syllables, taken with the fact that it is determined by the nature of the final Syllable, indicates a division of our Metres into Symmetrical (where the number of the Syllables is the multiple of the number of Accents), and Unsymmetrical (where it is not so).

For practical purposes, however, the length of the last Measure may be considered as indifferent, and the terms indicated may be reserved for the forthcoming Class of Metres.

§ 313. Of the Metres in question, Coleridge's Christabel and Byron's Siege of Corinth are the current specimens. In the latter we have the couplet

> He sát him dówn at a píllar's báse,
> And thréw his hánd athwárt his fáce.

In the second of these lines, the Accents and the Syllables are Symmetrical; which is not the case with the first. Now to every, or any, Accent in the second line an additional unaccented syllable may be added, and the movement be still preserved. It is the fact of the Accents and Syllables (irrespective of the latitude allowed to the final

measure) being here not Symmetrical (or, if Symmetrical, only so by accident) that gives to the Metres in question their peculiar character. Added to this, the change from *x x a* to *x a x*, and *a x x*, is more frequent than elsewhere. One point respecting them must be borne in mind; *viz.* that they are essentially Trisyllabic Metres from which unaccented Syllables are withdrawn, rather than Dissyllabic ones wherein unaccented Syllables are inserted.

§ 314. Of measures of one, and of measures of four Syllables the occurrence is rare, and perhaps equivocal.

Such the leading points in the English Metres. For the History of them the reader is referred to the work that has so often been quoted already, viz. Guest's English Rhythms.

APPENDIX A.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE WELSH OF THE CAMBRIAN, AND THE IRISH OF THE GAELIC BRANCH OF THE CELTIC STOCK.

1. In the great characteristic of the Celtic Languages, *viz.* the quantity of Inflection expressed by changes of the Initial Sounds, the two Languages coincide. The general Law embracing the whole principle of these changes has yet to be announced Neither has it been determined how far the changes in point are exclusively Inflectional, rather than in part Euphonic.

Inflections formed by changes of Initial Consonants.

The changes in Welsh, classified according to the relationship of the sounds, are;

1. From the Sharp Lenes to the corresponding Flats; as *p* to *b*, *t* to *d*, *c* to *g*. The changes in Irish are the same.

2. From the Flat Lenes to their corresponding Aspirates; as *b* to *v*, *d* to ð. This is the change in Welsh. In Irish we have the same, but only as far as *b* is concerned; the Aspirate of *d* (ð) being wanting in that Language. In neither Welsh nor Irish occurs the true Aspirate of *g*. In neither Welsh nor Irish occurs the true Aspirate of *c*; which, being wanting, is replaced by the sound of the *ch* in the German *auch*, here spelt *ç*.

Now the Welsh Grammarians deal with the changes from Sharp to Flat, and from Lene to Aspirate, alike; since, in respect to the Grammar of their Language, they are enabled to state that they take place under the same circumstances. Taken collectively they are called Light; and words wherein *p* is changed to *b*, and those wherein *b* is changed to *v*, are equally said to assume the Light Sound. This the Welsh express in spelling, and write *ben* for *pen*, and *vraint* for *braint*,

&c. &c. In Irish the arrangement is different. When a so-called Aspirate is substituted for a Lene, the word is said to take an Aspiration, and *bheul* is written for *beul*. If, however, the Sharp be made Flat, the original sound is said to be eclipsed. In spelling, however, it is preserved; so that *teine*, with the *t* changed, is written *dteine*, and pronounced *deine*. With this view we can now ask how far the change from *p* to *b*, *t* to *d*, *c* to *g*, *b* to *v*, and *c* to *ç*, takes place in Irish and Welsh under similar circumstances.

In *Welsh* — after all Verbs, except those of the Infinitive Mood; as *caravi gaer* (for *caer*), I love a fort.

In *Irish* — after all Verbs, provided that the Substantive be Masculine; as *ta me ag gearrad çrainn = I am cutting (at to cut) a tree.* Here *çrainn* comes from *crainn*. This change in Irish extends only to the change from Lene to Aspirate.

In *Welsh* — after the Possessive Pronouns *thy, thine, his, its, mine,* (but not *my*); as *dy vâr* (for *bâr*), *thy wrath*; *ei vraint* (from *braint*), *his privilege. N. B.* Although the same word (*ei*) means *her, his,* and *its,* it induces the Light change only when it is either Masculine or Neuter.

In *Irish* — after the Possessive Pronouns *my, thy,* and *his.* Here the change is of the first sort only, or an Aspiration; as *mo vàs* (*bàs*), *my death*; *do ços* (*cos*), *thy foot*; *a çeann* (*ceann*), *his head. N. B.* Although the same word (*a*) means *her, his,* and *its,* it induces the Aspirate only when it is either Masculine or Neuter.

In *Welsh* — the Initials of Adjectives become Light when their Substantive is Feminine.

In *Irish* — the Initials of Adjectives Singular, aspirated in the oblique cases only of the Masculine, are aspirated throughout in the Feminine.

In *Welsh* — after certain Adverbs called Formative, used like the English words *to, as,* &c. &c. in the formation of the Degrees of Nouns, and the Moods of Verbs, (in other words, after certain Particles,) Initial Sounds become Light; as *rhy ryçan* (*byçan*), *very (over) little*; *ni çarav* (*carav*), *I do not love.*

In *Irish* — the same, in respect to the change from Lene to Aspirate; *ro reag, very little*; *ni vualim* (*bualim*), *I do not beat*; *do vuaileas* (*I struck*), &c.

In *Welsh*—Initials are Light after all Prepositions except *in* and *towards*.

In *Irish* — the Prepositions either eclipse the Noun that they govern or else aspirate it. A Welsh Grammarian would say that it made them Light.

In *Welsh*—Initials of Feminines become Light after the Articles.

In *Irish* — Masculines are aspirated in the Genitive and Dative Singular; Feminines in the Nominative and Dative. *N. B.* The difference here is less than it appears to be. The Masculine Dative is changed, not as a Masculine, but by the effect of the Particle *do*, the sign of the Dative; the Genitive, perhaps, is changed *ob differentiam*. This being the fact, the Nominative is the only case that is changed *as such*. Now this is done with the Feminines only. The Inflection explains this.

Masc.	*Fem.*
Nom. an crann (*the tree*).	Nom. an ços (*the foot*).
Gen. an çrainn.	Gen. an cos.
Dat. don çrann.	Dat. don ços.
Acc. an crainn.	Acc. an cos.

Such the changes from Sharp to Flat, and from Lene to Aspirate. The Second order of changes is remarkable, *viz.* from the Mutes to their corresponding Liquids (see § 67), and, in the case of Series *k*, to *ng*. This, in Welsh, is as follows:—

Sharp.	*Flat.*
p to **m* + *h*.	*b* to *m*.
t to **n* + *h*.	*d* to *n*.
k to *ng* + *h*.	*g* to *ng*.

e. g. nheyrnas for *teyrnas*, *ngherð* for *cerð*, *Nuw* for *Duw*, &c. &c.

In Irish the combinations *m* + *h*, *n* + *h*, *ng* + *h* are wanting: *t*, however, under certain conditions, becomes *h*, as *mo high* (*ċigh*) = *my house*. With the unaspirated Liquids the change, however, coincides with that of the Welsh — *ar maile* (spelt *mbaile*), *our*

* As in *Amherst* and *inherent*.

town; ar nia (spelt *ndia*), *our God; ar ngearran, our complaint.* These words come respectively from *baile, dia, gearran.* To show that this change takes place in Irish and Welsh under similar circumstances is more than can be expected; since ð being wanting in Irish, leaves *d* to be changed into *n*.

Inflections formed by changes in the middle of words.

Plurals from Singulars.

Welsh.		*Irish.*	
Singular.	*Plural.*	*Singular.*	*Plural.*
Aber, *a conflux;*	ebyr.	Ball, *a spot;*	baill.
Barð, *a bard;*	beirð.	Cnoc, *a hill;*	cnoic.
Brân, *a crow;*	brain.	Poll, *a pit;*	poil.
Fon, *a staff;*	fyn.	Fonn, *a tune;*	foinn.
Maen, *a stone;*	mein.	Crann, *a tree;*	crainn.
Gûr, *a man;*	gûyr.	Fear, *a man;*	fir.
&c. &c.		&c. &c.	

Inflections formed by Addition.

Plural forms.—When not expressed by a change of vowel, *d* (or an allied sound) both in Welsh and Irish has a Plural power; as *merç, merçed; hyð, hyðoð; teyrn, teyrneð*; (*girls, stags, kings;*) Welsh: — *gealaç, gealaçad; sgolog, sgologad; uiseog, uiseogad;* (*moons, farmers, larks;*) Irish. In each Language there are Plural forms in *-d.*

Also in *-n*, as *dyn, a person; dynion, persons.* In Irish there is the form *cu, a greyhound;* Plural *cuin.* It may be doubted, however, whether *-n* is not ejected in the Singular rather than added in the Plural.

Also in *au*, Welsh (as *pén-au, heads*), and in *a*, Irish (as *cos-a, feet*).

In each Language there is, in respect to both Case and Gender, an equal paucity of Inflections. The Irish, however, preserves the Indo-European Dative Plural in *b;* as *ços-aib* = ped-*ibus.*

The Ordinals in Welsh are expressed by *-red;* as *saiþ, seven, seiþred, seventh.* The Ordinals in Irish are expressed by *-rad*, as *seaçt*, seven; seaçt-*rad*, seventh (spelt *seachmhadh*).

The terminations *-n* and *-g* are Diminutive in Welsh; as *dyn-yn, mannikin; oen-ig, lambkin.* They have the same power in Irish; as *cnoc-an, a hillock; duil-eog, a leaflet.*

In Irish, currently spoken, there is no Inflection for the Comparative Degrees; there is, however, an obsolete form in *-d*, as *glas, glaiside* = *green, greener.* In Welsh the true Comparative ends in -ç, as *main*, slender; *mainaç*, more slender. A form, however, exists in *-ed*, meaning equality, and so implying comparison; *viz. mein-ed*, so slender.

As expressive of an agent, the termination *-r* is common to both Languages. Welsh, *mor-ûr*, a seaman; *telynaur*, a harpist. Irish, *scalg-aire*, a hunter; *figead-oir*, a weaver.

As expressive of "*abounding in*," the termination *-c* (or *-g*) is common to both Languages. Welsh, *boliaûg*, abounding in belly. Irish, *toirteaç*, abounding in fruit.

In each Language, a sound of Series *t*, is equivalent to the English *-ly*. Welsh, *mab-aiδ*, boylike. Irish, *duin-eata*, manlike.

Vawr, Welsh = *full*, or *great*, as *gûerþvaûr*, costly. *Mur* in Irish means the same, *fion-mur*, full of wine.

The Passive Voice is characterized in Irish by the sounds *t* and *r*, single or combined; as *buailte*, struck; *buailtear me*, I am struck. Welsh, *adeil-ier* = *conditur*, *adeilid* = *condebatur*, *adeilias-id* = *conditum* (or *conditus*) *erat*, *adeil-ir* = *condetur.*

The Present Participle in Welsh ends in *-d*; as *adeil-iad, building.* The so-called Irish Infinitive ends in *-d*; as *a vualad, to strike.* Now the Irish Infinitive (so-called) is the Present Participle. It is always accompanied by a *particle* (*a* or *do*); so that the true Infinitive forms in the two Languages coincide.

The sign of the Perfect Tense in Welsh is *-s*; as *adeiliai-s, I have built.* The same in Irish (*do vualea-s*, I struck,) for the Præterite.

The sign of the Future Tense in Irish is *-f-*; as *buail-f-ead, bual-fe, buail-fi-mid* = *I, thou, we shall* (or *will*) *strike.* In the Welsh Paradigms there is for the Future no form in *f.* It is stated, however, as a remark on that Tense, that forms like *carif* (*amabit*), from *câr* (*amare*), are frequently used in the Third Person.

Of the Personal Terminations it may be said, that those of both the Irish and Welsh, are those of the other European Tongues, (see Part III, Ch. 13,) and that they coincide and differ in the same way with those of the Gothic stock; the form in *-m* being the one most constant. For the theory of the Personal Terminations the reader is referred to the Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations, by Dr. Pritchard.

The present Appendix being indicative of Grammatical affinities only, the Glossarial points of likeness between the Welsh and Irish are omitted.

B.

THE LANGUAGES DERIVED FROM THE LATIN.

THE Roman language overspread the greater part of the Roman empire. It supplanted a multiplicity of aboriginal languages; just as the English of North America *has* supplanted the aboriginal tongues of the native Indians, and just as the Russian *is* supplanting those of Siberia and Kamskatcha.

Sometimes the war that the Romans carried on against the old inhabitants was a war of extermination. In this case the original language was superseded *at once*. In other cases their influence was introduced gradually. In this case, the influence of the original language was greater and more permanent.

Just as in the United States the English came in contact with an American, whilst in New Holland it comes in contact with an Australian language, so was the Roman language engrafted, sometimes on a Celtic, sometimes on a Gothic, and sometimes on some other stock. In the present account the nature of the original language must always be borne in mind.

The great Classical stock (as seen in § 3) is divided into, 1st, the Hellenic; 2ndly, the Ausonian branch.

From Italy, its original seat, the Latin or Roman of the

Ausonian branch was extended in the following chronological order:—

1st. To the Spanish Peninsula, where it overlaid or was engrafted on languages allied to the present Biscayan, (*i. e.* languages of the Iberic stock,) mixed in a degree (scarcely determinable) with Celtic elements = Celtiberic.

2nd. To Gaul, or France, where it overlaid or was engrafted on languages of the Celtic stock. The particular branch to which the old language of Gaul is referable is undetermined.

This took place, at least for the more extreme parts of Gaul, in the time of Julius Cæsar; for the more contiguous parts, in the earlier ages of the Republic.

3rd. To Dacia and Pannonia. Here it overlaid or was engrafted on a language the stock whereof is undetermined. I am not satisfied with the arguments that have been adduced in order to show that the original Dacian was a language of the Classical stock, and consequently allied to the Latin. Neither am I convinced that it was (as it has appeared to some eminent philologers) Lithuanic.

The introduction of the Latin into Dacia and Pannonia took place in the time of Trajan.

From the original Latin of Italy, and from the imported Latin, of 1st the Spanish Peninsula, 2ndly Gaul, 3rd Dacia and Pannonia, we have (amongst others) the following modern languages; 1st Italian, 2nd Spanish and Portuguese, 3rd French, 4th Wallachian. How far these languages differ from each other is currently known. *One* essential cause of this difference is the difference of the original language upon which the Latin was engrafted.

I am not doing too much for the sake of system if I classify the languages, of which the Italian, French, &c. &c., are the representatives, as the languages of Germany were classified, *viz.* into Divisions.

The Spanish and Portuguese are sufficiently like the Italian to be arranged in a single Division. This may conveniently be called the Hesperian or Cisalpine Division.

The Second Division is the Transalpine. This comprises the Languages of Gaul, viz. the Modern French, the Anglo-Nor-

man, and the Provençal. It also includes the Romanese (*Rumonsch*), or the Language of the Grisons, or Graubünten. Of this last-named dialect, since it is comparatively but little known, I subjoin a specimen.

Luke xv. 11.

11. Ün Hum veva dus Filgs:

12. Ad ilg juven da quels schet alg Bab—Bab mi dai la Part de la Rauba c' aud' à mi: ad el parchè or ad els la Rauba.

13. A bucca bears Gis suenter, cur ilg Filg juven vet tut mess ansemel, scha tilà 'l navent en ünna Terra dalunsch: a lou sfiget el tut sia Rauba cun viver senza spargn.

14. A cur el vet tut sfaig, scha vangit ei en quella Terra ün grond Fumaz: ad el antschavet a ver basengs.

15. Ad el mà, à: sa plidè enn ün Burgeis da quella Terra: a quel ilg tarmatet or sin sês Beins a parchirar ils Porcs.

16. Ad el grigiava dad amplanir sieu Venter cun las Criscas ch' ils Porcs malgiavan; mo nagin lgi deva.

17. Mo el mà en sasez a schet: " Quonts Fumelgs da mieu Bab han budonza da Pann, a jou mier d' fom!"

18. Jou vi lavar si, ad ir tier mieu Bab, e vi gir a lgi: " Bab, jou hai faig puccau ancunter ilg Tschiel ad avont tei;

19. A sunt bucca pli vangonts da vangir numnaus tieu Filg: fai mei esser sco ün da tes Fumelgs."

It may be remarked upon the extract above that the orthography is German, and that there is in the Language an intermixture of German.

The precise relation of the Romanese with the other Transalpine Languages has yet to be determined.

The Third Division is the Dacian, Pannonian, or Wallachian, containing the present Languages of Wallachia and Moldavia.

In the *Jahrbücher der Literatur*, June 1829, specimens are given of two of its Dialects; 1, the Daco-Wallachian, north of the Danube; 2, the Macedono-Wallachian, south of the Danube. The present specimen varies from both. It is taken from the New Testament printed at Smyrna, 1838. The Dacian Division is marked by placing the Article after the Noun, as

homul, = *the man* = *homo ille*. The letters are Russian. In rendering these $c = ts$, and $c' = ch$ (in *chest*). Besides this a small short vowel (expressed in the Russian orthography) must be supposed to intervene between the more unpronounceable consonantal combinations.

Luke xv. 11.

11. Un om avea doĭ fec'orĭ.

12. Shi a zis c'el maĭ tinr din eĭ tatluĭ su: tat, dmĭ partea c'e mi se kade de avucie: shi de a imprcit lor avuciea.

13. Shi nu dup multe zile, adunint toate fec'orul c'el maĭ tinr, s'a dus intr 'o car departe, shi akolo a rsipit toat avuciea ca, viecuind intr dezmĭerdrĭ.

14. Shi keltuind el toate, c'a fkut foamete mare intr' ac'ea car; shi el a inc'eput a se lipsi.

15. Shi mergina c'a lipit de unul din lkuitorĭĭ crĭĭ ac'eia; si 'l a trimis pre el la carinide sale c pask porc'ĭĭ.

16. Shi doria c 'shĭ sature pintec'ele sŭ de roshkobele c'e minka porc'ĭĭ; shi nimĭnĭ nu ĭ da luĭ.

17. Iar viind intru sine, a zis: kicĭ argacĭ aĭ tatluĭ mieŭ sint indestulacĭ de piĭne, iar eŭ pĭeiŭ de foame.

18. Skula-m-voiŭ, shi m' voiŭ duc'e la tata mieŭ, shi voiŭ zic'e lui:

19. Tat, greshit-am la c'er shi inaintea ta, shi nu mai sint vrednik a m kema fiul tŭ: fm ka pre unul din argaciĭ tĭ.

Such (taken with those of §§ 20–22) are the leading specimens of the Modern Tongues derived from the Latin, a familiarity with the characters of the current French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese being presumed. The following sample of the Valentian of the 16th century shows how truly the character of that Language was French rather than Spanish.

Lo Libre de les Dones.

Deu Creador,	qual sol adore,	sos Manaments,
unich Senyor,	quant puch honore,	dos excellents
Omnipotent,	è reverixch,	singularment,
latriament,	tèm, obeixch	sols ell colent,

de cor sancer,
fas lo primer,
amant prohisme,
sens frau sophisme,
com mi mateix,
no sens perpleix
fas lo segon.
En aquest Mon
amar mon Dèu
per sguart sèu,
è mon prohisme
per Dèu altisme
tal charitat,
è voluntat
desig haver,
per à Dèu fer
servey algù,
è en comù,
axi amichs,
com enemichs,
bon adjutori,
tot meritori
charitatiu,
en Dèu confiu,
mendreçarà,
è mostrarà
les sues vies.

The Oath of A. D. 842 (p. 44) is the earliest instance of the modernized Latin. Anterior to this, the specimens, few and fragmentary, are as follows:—

1. *The Answer of Justinian.*

Augustus efficitur Justinianus; qui, nihil moratus, collecto exercitu contra barbaros est profectus, et commissâ pugnâ, fugatisque hostibus, regem se eorum cepisse gavisus est. Quem in solio regni juxtà se sedere fecit, et ut provincias quas Romanis eripuerat, sibi restitueret imperavit. Cui ille, non inquit, dabo. Ad hæc Justinianus respondit DARAS. Pro cujus novitate sermonis civitas eo loci constructa est cui DARAS nomen est. AIMOIN, lib. 2, c. 5.

2. *The Exclamation of the Soldiers of Commentiolus.*

The following extracts from Theophanes and Theophylact relate to a sudden terror infused into the army of Commentiolus, a general of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice, by the pursuit of a stray mule.

Παλινοστεῖν τε ἐδόα πᾶς γεγωνὼς διαπρύσιον, ἐπιχωρίῳ τῇ γλώττῃ, εἰς τὰπίσω τραπέσθαι ἄλλος ἄλλῳ προσέταττε ΠΕΤΟΥΝΑ μετὰ μεγίστης ταράχης φθεγγόμενοι.—Theophylact. Hist. ii. 15.—ἑνὸς γὰρ ζώου τῆ φόρτη διαστρέψαντος, ἕτερος τὸν δεσπότην τῆ ζώῳ προσεφώνει τὸν φόρτον ἀνορθώσασθαι τῇ πατρώᾳ φωνῇ ΤΟΥΝΑ, ΤΟΥΝΑ, ΦΡΑΤΡΕ. Καὶ ὁ μὲν κύριος τὴν ἡμιόνην τῆς φωνῆς ἐκ ἤσθετο: οἱ δὲ λαοὶ ἀκούσαντες καὶ τῆς πολεμίης ἐπιστῆναι αὐτοὶς ὑπονόησαντες εἰς φυγὴν ἐτράπησαν ΤΟΥΝΑ ΤΟΥΝΑ μεγίσταις

φωναῖς ἀνακράζοντες. — Theophanes, Chronographia, p. 218. *Hist. Byz.* Par. 1655.

3. *The Ordinance of Alboacem.*

Spanish; A. D. 734.

Alboacem Iben Mahumet Alhamar, Iben Tarif, bellator fortis, vincitor Hispaniarum, dominator Cantabriæ Gothorum, et magnæ litis Roderici. Quoniam nos constituit Allah, Illalah super gentem Nazarat, e fecit me dominatorem Colimb, et omni terræ inter Goadaluam, et Mondecum, et Goadatha per ubi esparte meum mandum. Ego ordinavi, quod Christiani de meas terras pecten dupliciter quam Mauri, et de ecclesiis per singulas xxv. pesantes de bono argento, et per monasteria peiten L. pesantes et vispesantes pecten cent santes: et Christiani habeant in Colimb suum comitem, et in Goadatha alium comitem de suâ gente, qui manteneat eos in bono juzgo, secundum solent homines Christiani, et isti component rixas inter illos, et non matabunt hominem sine jussu de Alcaide, seu Aluacile Sarraceno. Sed ponent illum apres de Alcaide, et mostrabunt suos juzgos, et ille dicebit: bene est; et matabunt culpatum. In populationibus parvis ponent suos judices, qui regant eos benè, et sine rixas. Si autem contingat homo Christianus quod matet, vel injuriet hominem Maurum, Alvacir seu Alcaide faciat de illo secundum juzgo de Mauris; si Christianus esforciaverit Sarracenam virginem, sit Maurus et recipiat illam, sin matent eum; si fuerit de marito, matent eum; si Christianus fuerit ad Mesquidam vel dixerit male de Allah, vel Mahamet, fiant Maurus, sin matent eum. Bispi de Christianis non maledicant reges Maurorum, sin moriantur. Presbyteri non faciat suas missas, nisi portis cerratis, sin pieten x pesantes argenti: monasteria quæ sunt in meo mando habeant sua bona in pace, et pechen prædictos L. pesantes. Monasterium de Montanis, qui dicitur Laurbano, non peche nullo pesante, quoniam bona intentione monstrant mihi loca de suis venatis, e faciunt Sarracenis bona acolhenza, et nunquam invenit falsum, neque malum animum in illis, qui morant ibi, et totas suas hæreditates possideant cum pace, et bona quiete, sine rixa et sine vexatione, neque forcia de Mauris, et veniant, et vadant ad

Colimbriam cum libertate per diem, et per noctem, quando meliùs velint aut nolint, emant et vendant sine pecho, tali pacto quòd non vadant foras de nostras terras sine nostro aparazmo, et benè velle; et quia sic volumus, et ut omnes sciant, facio cartam salvo conducto, et do Christianis ut habeant illam pro suo juzgo, et mostrent, cum Mauri requisiverint ab illis. Et si quis de Sarracenis non sibi observaverit nostrum juzgo in quo fecerit damnum, componant pro suo avere, vel pro sua vita, et sit juzgo de illo, sicut de Christiano usque ad sanguinem et vitam. Fuit facta carta de juzgo, æra de Christianis DCC,LXXII, secundum verò annos Arabum CXXXXVII. Luna XIII. Dulhija Alboacem, iben Mahomet Alhamar, iben Tarif rogatu Christianorum firmavi pro more · O · et dederunt pro robore duos æquos optimos, et ego confirmavi totum.

4. *The Litany of Charlemagne.*—Santa Maria—ORA PRO NOS.* Redemptor Mundi—TU LO JUVA.

5. Isolated expressions in early Chartas—In loco *la* Ferrara; A.D. 793.—Ego Hugo *della* Rocca; A.D. 810.—*Strada* = Strata; A.D. 781.—Ab ipso memorato principe *lui* concessa; A.D. 650.

With the exceptions of specimens of bad Latinity (ad die presente), and changes confined to single letters (plènius = plenius), the above list, taken from Raynouard † and Ampere,‡ is considered to be exhaustive of the examples of the Latin Language in its transition state, anterior to the Oath of A.D. 842; with which the Modern Tongues may be said to take their origin.

* Strictly speaking, this is ungrammatical rather than modernized Latin.

† Choix des Poesies des Troubadours.—*Vol.* I.

‡ Histoire de la Littérature Française du Moyen Age.—*Vol.* I.

C.

THE ANGLO-SAXON ORTHOGRAPHY.

The *a* in *father* sounded Long.—Except so far as it preceded *l* (see *p.* 159), and *r* (see a remark on the word *near*, *p.* 242), or so far as it was interchanged with the *aw* in *bawl*, it is by no means certain that this sound was current in A. S. If spelt at all, it was spelt with *a*, often preceded by *e*. The English words *leek*, *ear*, *heap*, &c. are in A. S. *leác*, *eáre*, *heáp*. Irrespective of the combination just noticed, the words in A. S. where it occurs Long are in the present English sounded as the *a* in *fate*; as *scacan*, *nama*, *tama* = *shake*, *name*, *fate*.

The same Short, as in *hand*, *wald*, G.—This, if distinguished from the *a* in *hat*, was spelt *a*; as *mann*, *camp*, *lufian*, *endas*.

The *a* in *fate*—spelt by *a*, or a modification of *a*, *viz.* *æ* or *ä*; as *stäf* or *stæf*, *stave*; *hær* or *här*, *hair*.

The *a* in *fat*—spelt by *ä* or *æ* short; as *cræft*, *cräft* = *craft*.

The *é fermé*—spelt by *e*; as *beran*, *teran*, *brecan*, *to bear*, *to tear*, *to break*. Since become *ee* in *feet*.

The same sound Short—not distinguished from that of the *a* in *fat* on one side, and the *e* in *bed* on the other.

The *e* in *bed*—spelt by *e*; as *web*, *bed*, *hnecca* = *web*, *bed*, *neck*.

The *ee* in *feet*—not distinguished from the *é fermé*. *He*, *we*, *stelan*, *cwen* = *he*, *we*, *steal*, *queen*.

The *i* in *pit*—spelt *i*; as *til*, *tin*.

The German *ü*—spelt *y*; as *cyn*, *tyrf*. Since become, in many cases, the *ee* in *feet*.

The *oo* in *book*—doubtful if distinguished from the *o chiuso*.

The *ou* in *could*—spelt *u*; as *full*, *full*.

The *o chiuso* Long—since become the *oo* in *book*; spelt *o*, as *boc*, *book*.

The *o chiuso* Short—not distinguished from the *ou* in *could* on one side, and the *o* in *not* on the other.

The *aw* in *bawl*—spelt by *a*, or a modification of *a*; as *brád* *broad*.

The *o* in *note* — confused with the *aw* in *bawl*, and spelt with *a*; as *bân, bone.*

The *o* in *not*—spelt *o*; *storm, long.*

The *i* in *fight*, diphthongal—spelt by *i*; as *bitan, to bite; smi'an, to smite.*

The *ou* in *house*, diphthongal—spelt by *u* long; as *hús, house; tún, town.*

By taking the sounds, and determining the representation of them, we get clearer views of the nature of Orthographical Expedients. (See page 157.) We also see how a single false view of the relation of two sounds may affect a whole Orthography.

It must not be concealed that the whole argument respecting the sounds in A. S. is subject to the remarks of § 109.

The expression of the Length of vowels is in the A. S. manuscripts, either a Reduplication, as *tiid*, or an *acute* accent, as *tíd.* The use of the Circumflex ˆ = ′, is referable to the printed books in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The use of *ä* for *æ* (or rather the distinction between the two) is modern.—D. G. i. 222–232.

Of the Consonants, the only ones that present difficulties are *c* and *g* before a semivowel, or a small vowel. In this case *c* A. S. = *ch* English, and *g* A. S. = *y* English; as *gear*, year; *ceaf*, chaff. Now if it be remembered that *e* A. S. had the power of *y*; and if the power of *y*, (mentioned § 78,) be borne in mind, the change from *cy* to *csh*, and from *csh* to *tsh*, becomes natural.

For the change of *g*, the affinities between *g* and *y* are accountable.

The combination *ce* preceded by *s* is in English *sh*; as *sceát* = *shot.* The natural sound of *sce* (that of *scsh*), recognized in the Slavonic tongues, is foreign to the Gothic. Hence the ejection of the *c* element, leaving the combination in the condition of *se* (or *sy*), subject to the influences of § 78. Taken together the Norwegian and Swedish Orthographies verify these views; since, there, *kj* Norse = *ksh*; *kj* Swedish = *tsh*; *skj* Norse = *sh*; *tj* Sw. = *tsh*; *stj* (*stsh*) = *sh* (*stjärna* being pronounced *sherna*), and *gj* = *y.* *N.B.* *J* Norse = *e* A.S., and *y* English.

The *time* when *ky* became *tsh*, is hitherto undetermined.

D.

EXTRACT FROM RICHARDSON'S DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

——"Each consonant letter requires, for its complete utter-
"ance, a breathing precedent, a closure or collision of some
"of the organs of speech, and an aperture or separation of them,
"with a breathing subsequent. Take, for instance, the labials
"B and M; call the first (with the vowel preposed, áb, éb, ám,
"ém,) the announced sound; call the second (with the vowel
"subjoined, bà, bè, mà, mè,) the enounced sound; and to the
"two we may give the name of connuciate—ábbà."—*Preliminary Essay, p.* 6.

This extract has been made for the sake of adding authority to the assertions of § 90, on the Formation of Syllables.

It may also be stated that the sequence of the Vowels in § 72, coincides with the sequence of Professor Willis, as exhibited in the Cambridge Philosophical Transactions, 1832.

Thus, the arrangement formed on Acoustic experiments and the arrangement formed on the Study of Language coincide. As I wish the statement both of § 90 and of § 72 to carry with them the weight of independent evidence, I mention that the conclusions there exhibited were arrived at irrespective of the researches of others.

E.

EXTRACTS FROM ANGLO-SAXON AND SCANDINAVIAN.

I.

ANGLO-SAXON.

Evangelium Nicodemi, xxvi.

From Thwaites's Heptateuch.

Hyt wæs ða swiþe angrislic, ða ða Satanas, ðære Helle ealdor and þæs deaþes heretoga, cwæþ to þære Helle; "Gegearwa
"þe sylfe, þat ðu mæge Chryst onfon; se hyne sylfne gewuldrod

" hæfð, and ys Godes sunu and eac man, and eac se Deað ys
" hyne ondrædende, and myn sawl ys swa unrot þæt me þincþ
" þæt ic alybban ne mæg, for þig he ys mycel wyðerwynna and
" yfel wyrcende ongean me, and eac ongean þe; and fæla, þe ic
" hæfde to me gewyld and to atogen, blynde and healte, geby-
" gede and hreoslan, ealle he fram ðe atyhð." Seo Hell þa,
swiþe grymme and swiþe egeslice, andswarode ða Satanase ðam
ealdan deofle, and cwæð; " Hwæt is se þe ys swa strang and
" swa myhtig, gif he man is, þæt he ne sig þone Deað ondræ-
" dende, þe wyt gefyrn beclysed hæfdon, for þam ealle þa þe on
" eorþan anweald hæfdon þu hig myd þynre myhte to me
" getuge, and ic hig fæste geheold: and, gif þu swa mihhtig
" eart swa þu ær wære, hwæt ys se man and se Hælend þe ne
" sig þone Deað and þyne mihte ondrædende? to forðan ic wat,
" gif he on mennyscnysse swa mihtig ys, þæt he naþer ne unc ne
" þone Deað ne ondræt, þonne gefohð he þe and þe byþ æfre
" wa to ecere worulde." Satanas þa, þæs cwicsusles ealdor,
þære Helle andswarode, and þus cwæð: " Hwæt twyneð þe,
" oþþe hwæt ondrædst þu þe þone Hælend to onfonne, mynne
" wyþerwynnan and eac þynne; Ac forðon ic his costnode, and ic
" gedyde him þæt eal þæt Iudeisce folc þæt hig wæron ongean
" him myd yrre and mid andan awehte, and ic gedyde þæt he
" wæs mid spere gesticod, and ic gedyde þæt hym man dryn-
" can mengde myd eallan and myd ecede, and ic gedyde þæt
" man hym treowene rode gegearwode, and hyne þær on aheng,
" and hyne mid næglum gefæstnode and nu æt nextan ic wylle
" his deað to þe gelædan, and he sceal beon underþeod agwhær
" ge me ge þe." Seo Hell þa swyþe angrysenlice þus cwæþ;
" Wyte þæt ðu swa do þæt he ða deadan fram me ateo, for
" þam þe her fæla syndon geornfulle fram me mig, þæt hig on
" me wunian noldon; ac ic wat þæt hig fram mig ne gewytaþ
" þurh heora agene myhte, butan hig se Ælmytiga God fram
" me ateo, se þe Lazarum of me genam, þone þe ic heold
" deadne feower nyht fæstne gebunden, ac ic hyne æft cwicne
" ageaf þurh his bebodu." Da andswarode Satanas and cwæþ:
" Se ylca hyt is se þe Lazarum of unc bam genam." Seo Hell
hym þa þus to cwæþ. " Eala ic halgige þe þuhr þyne mægenu,
" and eac þuhr myne, þæt þu næfre ne gepafige þæt he on me
" cume, for þam þa ic gehyrde, þæt word his bebodes, ic wæs

" myd miclum ege afyrilit, and ealle myne arleasan þenas
" wæron samod myd me gedrehte and gedrefede, swa þæt we
" ni myhton Lazarum gehealdan, ac he wæs hyne asceacende
" eal swa earn þonne he myd hræðum flythe wyle forð afleon,
" and he swa wæs fram us ræfende, and seo eorþe þe Lazarus
" deadan lichaman heold, heo hyne cwycne ageaf, and þæt ic nu
" wat þæt se man þe eall þæt gedyde þæt he ys on Gode strang
" and myhtig, and gif þu hyne to me lædest, ealle þa þe her
" syndon on þysum wælhreowan cwearterne beclysde, and on
" þysum bendum myd synnum gewryðene, ealle he myd þys god-
" cundnysse fram me atyhð, and to lyfe gelæt."

II.

From Schmid's Anglo-Saxon Laws.

Þis syndon þa domas þe Ælfred se cyning geceas.

Drihten wæs sprecende þæs word to Moyse and þus cwæð:

1. Ic eam drihten þin god. Ic þe utgelædde of Ægypta londe and of heora þeowdome; ne lufa þu oðre fremde godas ofer me.

2. Ne minne naman ne cig þu on idelnesse, forþon þe þu ne bist unscyldig wið me, gif þu on idelnesse cigst minne naman.

3. Gemine þæt þu gehalgie þone ræstedæg. Wyrceað eow syx dagas, and on þam seofoðan restað eow, þu and þin sunu and þine dohter and þin þeowe and þine wylne and þin weorcnyten and se cuma þe bið binnan þinan durum. Forþam on syx dagum Crist geworhte heofenas and eorðan, sæs and ealle gesceafta þe on him sint and hine gereste on þam seofoðan dæge, and forþon drihten hine gehalgode.

4. Ara þinum fæder and þinre meder, þa þe drihten sealde þe, þæt þu sy þy leng libbende on eorðan.

5. Ne slea þu.

6. Ne stala þu.

7. Ne lige þu dearnunga.

8. Ne sæge þu lease gewitnesse wið þinum nehstan.

9. Ne wilna þu þines nehstan yrfes mid unrihte.

10. Ne wyrc þu þe gyldene godas oððe seolfrene.

11. Þis synd þa domas þe þu him settan scealt. § 1. Gif hwa gebycge Christenne þeow, VI gear þeowige he, þe seofoðan

beo he freoh orceapunga. § 2. Mid swylce hrægle he ineode, mid swilce gange he ut. § 3. Gif he wif sylf hæbbe, gange heo ut mid him. § 4. Gif se hlaford þonne him wif sealde, sy heo and hire bearn þæs hlafordes. § 5. Gif se þeowa þonne cwæðe: nelle ic fram minum hlaforde, ne fram minum wife, ne fram minum bearne,—breng hine þonne his hlaford to þære dura þæs temples and þurhþyrlige his eare mid eale to tacne, þæt he sy æfre syððan þeow.

* * * * * *

13. Se man þe his gewealdes monnan ofslea, swelte se deaðe. Se-þe hine þonne neades ofsloge oððe unwillum oððe ungewealdes, swylce hine god swa sende on his honda and he hine ne ymb syrede, sy he his feores wyrðe and folcrihtre bot, gif he fryðstowe gesece. Gif hwa þonne of gyrnesse oððe gewealdes ofslea his þone nehstan þurh syrwa, aluc þu hine fram minum weofode, to þam þæt he deaðe swelte.

14. Se-þe slea his fæder oððe his modor, se sceal deaðe sweltan.

15. Se-þe frione forstæle and he hyne bebycge and hit onbetæled sy, þæt he hine bereccan ne mæg, swelte se deaðe. § 1. Se-þe wyrge his fæder oððe his modor, swelte se deaðe.

16. Gif hwa slea his þone nehstan mid stane oððe mid fyste, and he þeah utgangan mæge be stafe, begyte him læce and wyrce his weorc þa hwile, þe he sylf ne mæge.

17. Se-þe slea his agenne þeowne esne oððe mennen, and he ne sy þy dæges dead, þeah he libbe twa niht oððe þreo, ne bið he ealles swa scyldig, forþon þe hit wæs his agen feoh. Gif he þonne sy idæges dead, þonne sitte seo scyld on him.

18. Gif hwa on ceast eacniend wif gewerde, bete þone æfwyrdlan swa him domeras gereccan. Gif heo dead sy, sylle sawle wið sawle.

19. Gif hwa oðrum his eage oðdo, sylle his agen for; toð for toð, handa for handa, fet for fet, bærning for bærning, wund wið wund, læl wið læle.

20. Gif hwa ofslea his þeowe oððe his þeowenne þæt eage ut, and he þonne hi gedo ænigge, gefreoge hi forþon. Gif he þonne toð ofslea, do þæt ylce.

21. Gif oxa ofhnite wer oððe wif, þæt hy deade synd, sy he mid stanum ofweorpod and ne sy his flæsc geeton and se hlaford bið unscyldig. § 1. Gif se oxa hnitol wære twam dagum ære oððe þrym and se hlaford hit wist and hinc inne betynan nolde, and he þonne were oððe wif ofsloge, sy he mid stanum ofworpod and sy se hlaford ofslegen oððe forgolden, swa þæt witan to riht findan. § 2. Sunu oððe dohtor gif he ofstinge, þæs ylcan domes sy he wyrðe. § 3. Gif he þonne þeow oððe þeowe mennen ofstynge, gesylle þæm hlaford XXX scill. scolfres and se oxa sy mid stanum ofworpod.

22. Gif hwa adelfe wæterpytte oððe betynedne untyne and hine eft ne betyne, gyld swylc neat swa þær on befealle and hæbbe him þæt dead.

23. Gif oxa oðres mannes oxan gewundige and he þonne dead sy, bebycggen þone oxan and hæbben him þæt weorð gemæne and eac þæt flæsc swa þæs deadan. Gif se hlaford þonne wiste, þæt se oxa hnitol wære and hine healdan nolde, sylle him oðerne oxan fore and hæbbe him ealle þæt flæsc.

24. Gif hwa forstæle oðres oxan and hine ofslea oððe bebycge, sylle twegen wið and feower sceap wið anum. Gif he næbbe hwæt he sylle, sy he sylf beboht wið þam feoh.

25. Gif þeof brece mannes hus nihtes and he wyrðe þær ofslægen, ne sy he na manslæges scyldig, þe him sloge. Gif he syððan æfter sunnan upgonge þis deð, he bið mansleges scyldig, and he þonne sylfa swylte, butan he nyddæda wære. Gif mid him cwicum sy funden þæt he ær stale, be twyfealdum forgylde hit.

26. Gif hwa gewerde oðres monnes wingeard oððe his æceras oððe his landes awuht, gebete swa hit man geeahtige.

27. Gif fyr sy ontended ryt to bærnenne, gebete þone æfwerdelsan se þæt fyr ontendeð.

28. Gif hwa oðfæste his friend feoh, gif he hit sylf stæle, forgylde be twyfealdum. § 1. Gif he nyste, hwa hit stæle, geladige hine sylfne, þæt he þær nan facn ne gefremede. § 2. Gif hit þonne cucu feoh wære and he secge, þæt hit here name oððe þæt hit sylf acwæle, and he gewitnesse hæbbe, ne þearf he þæt gyldan. § 3. Gif he þonne gewitnesse næbbe, and he him ne getriewe ne sy, swerige he þonne.

* * * * *

30. Þa fœmnan þe gewunniað onfon galdorcræftigan and scinlæcan and wiccan, ne læt þu þa libban.

* * * * *

32. And se þe godgeldum onsæcge ofer god ænne, swelte deaðe.

33. Utancumene and ælþeodige ne geswenc þu no, forþon þe ge wæron ælþeodige on Ægypta lande.

34. Þa wudewan and þa steopcilde ne sceaðdað ne hi nawer deriað. Gif ge þonne elles doð, hi cleopiað to me and ic gehire hi, and ic eow þonne slea mid minum sweorde and ic gedo þæt eowra wif bið wudewan and eowre bearn byð steopcilde.

35. Gif þu feoh to borh gesylle þinum geferan, þe mid þe eardian wille, ne nide þu hine swa nidling and ne gehene þu hine mid þy eacan.

36. Gif man næbbe butan anfeald hrægle hine mid to wreonne and to werianne and he hit to wedde sylle, ær sunnan setlgange sy hit agyfen. Gif þu swa ne dest, þonne cleopað he to me and ic hine gehyre, forþon þe ic eom swiðe mildheort.

37. Ne tæl þu þinne drihten, ne þone hlaford þæs folces ne werge þu.

38. Þine teoðan sceattas and þine frumripan gangendes and weaxendes agyfe þu gode.

39. Ealle þæt flæsc þæt wilddeor lafan, ne etan ge þæt ac syllað hit hundum.

40. Leases mannes word ne recce þu no þæs to gehyranne, ne his domas ne geþafa þu, ne næne gewitnysse æfter him ne saga þu.

41. Ne wend þu þe na on þæs folces unræd and on unriht gewillon hiora spræce and gecleps ofer þin riht, and on þæs unwisestan lare þu ne geþafa.

42. Gif þe becume oðres mannes gymeleas feoh on hand, þeah hit sy þin feonde, gecyðe hit him.

43. Dem þu swiðe emne; ne dem þu oðerne dom þæm welegan oðerne þam earman, ne oðerne þam leofran oðerne þam laðran ne deme þu.

44. Onscuna þu a leasunga.

45. Soðfæstne man and unscildigne, ne acwele þu þone æfre.

46. Ne onfo þu næfre medsceattum, forþon hi ablendað ful oft wisra manna geþoht and hiora word onwendað.

47. Þam ælþeodigan and utancumenan ne læt þu na uncuðlice wið hine, ne mid nanum unrihtum þu hine ne drecce.

48. Ne swerigen ge næfre under hæðene godas, ne on nanum þingum ne cleopien ge to him.

III.

*The Battle of Brunanburg.**

Æthelstán cyning,
eorla drihten,
beorna beáh-gyfa,
and his bróther eac,
Eadmund ætheling,
ealdor langne tir,
geslogon æt secce,
sweorda ecgum,
ymbe Brunanburh.
Bord-weal clufon,
heowon heatho-linda,
hamora lafum,
eáforan Eadweardes.
Swa him geæthele wæs
from cneo-mægum
thæt híe æt campe oft,
with lathra gehwæne,
land ealgodon,
hord and hámas,
hettend crungon.
Scotta leode,
and scip-flotan,
fæge feollon.
Feld dennade,
secga swate,
sith-than sunne úp,
on morgen-tíd,
mære tuncgol,
glád ofer grundas,
Godes candel beorht,
éces Drihtnes;
oth-thæt sio æthele gesceaft,
sáh tó setle.
Thær læg secg monig,
gárum ageted,
guman northerne,
ofer scyld scoten.
Swylc Scyttisc eac,
werig wiges sæd.
West-Seaxe forth,
ondlangne dæg
eorod-cystum,
on last lægdon
lathum theodum.
Heowon here-flyman,
hindan thearle,
mecum mylen-scearpum.
Myrce ne wyrndon

* From Warton's History of English Poetry. *Ed.* 1840. Vol. I. p. lxvii.

heardes hand-plegan,
hæletha nanum,
thára the mid Anlafe,
ofer ear-geblond,
on lides bosme,
land gesohton,
fæge to feohte.
Fife lægon,
on thám campstede,
cyningas geonge,
sweordum aswefede.
Swylc seofen éac
eorlas Anlafes;
unrím heriges,
flotan and Sceotta.
Thær geflymed wearth
Northmanna bregu,
nyde gebæded,
to lides stefne,
litle werede.
Cread cnear on-flot,
cyning ut-gewat,
on fealowe flod,
feorh generede.
Swylc thær éac se froda,
mid fleame cóm,
on his cyththe north,
Constantinus,
har hylderinc.
Hreman ne thórfte
mecca gemanan.
Her wæs his maga sceard,
freonda gefylled,
on folc-stede,
beslægen æt secce;
and his sunu (he) forlet
on wæl-stowe,
wundum-forgrunden,
geongne æt guthe.
Gylpan ne thórfte,
beorn blanden-feax,
bill-geslehtes,
eald inwitta;
ne Anláf thy má,
mid heora here-lafum,
hlihan ne thorfton,
thæt hí beadu-weorca
beteran wurdon,
on camp-stede,
cumbol-gehnastes,
gár mittinge,
gumena gemotes,
wæpen-gewrixles,
thæs the híe on wæl-felda
with Eadweardes
eáforan plegodon.
Gewiton hym tha Northmen,
nægledon cnearrum,
dreorig daretha láf,
on dinges mere,
ofer deop wæter,
Dyflin secan,
eft Yraland,
æwisc-mode.
Swylce thá gebrother,
begen æt samne,
cyning and ætheling,
cyththe sohton,
West Seaxna land,
wiges hremige.
Læton him behindan,
hrá brittian,
salowig padan,
thone sweartan hræfn,
hyrned-nebban;
and thone hasean padan,
earn æftan hwit,
æses brucan,

grædigne guth-hafoc ;
and thæt græge deor,
wulf on wealde.
Ne wearth wæl máre,
on thys igland,
æfre gyta,
folces gefylled,
beforan thissum,
sweordes ecgum,
thæs the us secgath béc,
ealde uthwitan,
sith-than eastan hider
Engle and Seaxe
úp becomon,
ofer brade brimu
Brytene sohton,
wlance wig-smithas,
Wealas ofer-comon,
eorlas árhwáte,
eard begeaton.

IV.

ICELANDIC.

From Snorro's Heimskringla.

Y'NGLINGA SAGA.

KAP. I.

Her Segir frá Landa Skipan.

Sva er sagt, at kringla heimsins, sú er mannfólkit byggir, er mjök vag-skorin: gánga höf stór úr útsjánum inn í jordina. Er þat kunnigt, at haf gengr af Njorvasundum, ok allt út til Jórsala-lands. Af hafinu gengr lángr hafsbotn til landnordrs, er heitir Svartahaf: sa skilr heims þridjúngana: heitir fyrin austan Asia, en fyrir vestan kalla sumir Evrópa, en sumir Enea. En nordan at Svartahafi gengr Sviþjod in mikla eda in kalda. Svíþjód ena miklu kalla sumir menn ecki minni enn Serkland hít mikla; sumir jafna henni vid Blá-land hit mikla. Hinn neyrdri lutr Svíþjódar liggr óbygdr af frosti ok kulda, sva sem hinn sydri lutr Blálands er audr af sólar-bruna. I Svíþjód eru stór hérut mörg: þar eru ok margskonar þjódir undarligar, ok margar túngur: þar eru risar, ok þar eru dvergar; þar eru ok blámenn: þar eru dýr ok drekar furdulega stórin. Ur Nordri frá fjöllum þeim, er fyrir utan eru bygd alla, fellr á um Svíþjód, sú er at rettu heitir Tanais; hún var fordum köllut Tanaqvísl edr Vanaquísl; hún kémur til sjávar inu i Svarta-haf. I Vanaqvíslum var þa kallat Vanaland, edr Vanaheimr; sú á skiir heimsþridjúngana; heitir fyrir austan Asia, en fyrir vestan Evrópa.

KAP. II.

Frá Asía Mönnum.

Fyrir austan Tanaqvísl í Asía, var kallat Asa-land edr Asa-heimr; en höfutborgina, er í var landinu, kölludu þeir Asgard. En í borginni var höfdingi sá er Odinn var kalladr, þar var blótstadr mikill. Þar var þar sidr at 12 hofgodar vóru æztir; skyldu þeir ráda fyrir blótum ok dómum manna í milli; þat eru Diar kalladir edr drottnar: þeim skyldi þjónustu veita allr folk ok lotníng. Odinn var hermadr mikill ok mjök vidförull, ok eignadiz mörg riki: han var sva Sigrfæll, at í hvörri orustu feck hann gagn. Ok sva kom at hans menn trúdu því, at hann ætti heimilann sigr í hverri orustu. Þat var háttr hans ef ann sendi menn sína til orustu, edr adrar sendifarar, at hann lagdi adr hendur í höfut þeim, ok gaf þeim bjanak: trúdu þeir at þá mundi vel faraz. Sva var ok um hans menn, hvar sem þeir urdu í naudum staddir á sjá edr á landi, þá kölludu þeir á nafn hans, ok þóttuz jafnan fá af því fro; þar þottuz þeir ega allt traust er hann var. Hann fór opt sva lángt í brot, at hann dvaldiz í ferdinni mörg misseri.

V.

SAGA O'LAFS KONU'NGS TRYGGVASONAR.

Bardagi í Storð.

Hákon konúngr hafði þá fylkt liði síno, ok segja menn at hann steypti af sèr brynjunni áðr orrostan tækist; Hákon konúngr valdi mjök menn með sèr í hirð at afli ok hreysti, svâ sem gert hafði Haraldr konúngr faðir hans; þar var þá með konúngi Þórálfr hinn sterki Skólmsson, ok gekk á aðra hlið konúngi; hann hafði hjálm ok skjöld, kesju ok sverð þat er kallat var Fetbreiðr; þat var mælt at þeir Hákon konúngr væri jafnsterkir; þessa getr Þórðr Sjáreksson í drápu þeirri er hann orti um Þórálf:

Þar er bavðharðir börðust
bands jó draugar landa
lystr gekk herr til hjörva
hnitz í Storð á Fitjum:

ok gimslöngvir gánga
gífrs hlèmána drífu
nausta blaks hit næsta
Norðmanna gram þorði.

En er fylkíngar gengu saman, var fyrst skotit spjótum, þvínæst brugðu menn sverðum; Gerðist þá orostan óð ok mannskjæd; Hákon konúngr ok Þórálfr gengu þá fram um merkin ok hjöggu til beggja handa; Hákon konúngr var auðkendr, meiri enn aðrir menn, lýsti ok mjök af hjálmi hans er sólin skein á; þá varð vopnaburðr mikill at konúngi; tók þá Eyvindr Finnsson hatt einn, ok setti yfir hjálm konúngsins; þá kallaði hátt Eyvindr Skreyja: leynist hann nú Norðmanna konúngr, eðr hefir hann flýit, þvíat horfinn er nú gullhjálmrinn? Eyvindr ok Álfr bróðir hans gengu þá hart fram svâ sem óðir ok galnir væri, hjöggu til beggja handa; þá mælti Hákon konúngr hátt til Eyvindar: haltu svâ fram stefnunni ef þú vill finna hann Norðmanna konúng. Var þá skamt at bíða at Eyvindr kom þar, reiddi upp sverþit ok hjó til konúngs; Þórálfr skaut við honum Eyvindi skildinum, svâ at hann stakaði við; konúngr tók þá tveim höndum sverþit Kvernbít, ok hjó til Eyvindar, klauf hjálminn ok höfuðit alt í herþar niðr; í því bili drap Þórálfr Álf Askmann. Svâ segir Eyvindr Skáldaspillir:

Veit ek at beit enn bitri
byggvíng meðal dyggvan
búlka skíðs or báðum
benvöndr konúngs höndum:
úfælinn klauf ála
eldraugar skör hauga
gullhjaltaðum galtar
grandráðr Dana brandi.

Eptir fall þeirra bræðra gekk Hákon konúngr svâ hart fram at alt hravkk fur honum; sló þá felmt ok flótta á lið Eiríks sona, en Hákon konúngr var í öndverðri sinni fylkíng, ok fylgði fast flóttamönnum, ok hjó tíðt ok hart; þá fló ör ein, er Fleinn er kallaðr, ok kom í hönd Hákoni konúngi uppi í músina firir neþan öxl, ok er þat margra manna sögn at skósveinn Gunnhildar, sá er Kispíngr er nefndr, ljóp fram í þysinn ok kallaði: gefi rúm konúngs bananum, ok skaut þá fleinnum til konúngs; en sumir segja at engi vissi hverr skaut; má þat ok vel vera, firir

því at örvar ok spjót ok önnur skotvâpn flugu svâ þykkt sem drífa; fjöldi manns fèll þar af Eiríks sonum, en konúngarnir allir komust á skipin, ok rèro þegar undan, en Hákonar menn eptir þeim; svâ segir Þórðr Sjáreksson:

Varði víga myrðir
vídt svá skal frið slíta
jöfur vildo þann eldast
öndvert fólk á löndum:
starf hófst upp, þá er arfi
ótta vanr á flótta
gulls er gramr var fallinn
Gunnhildar kom sunnan.

Þrót var sýnt þá er settust
sinn róðr við þraum stinna
maðr lèt önd ok annarr
úfár bændr sárir
afreks veit þat er jöfri
allríkr í styr slíkum
göndlar njörðr sá er gerði
gekk næst hugins drekku.

Andlát Hákonar Aðalsteins fóstra.

Hákon konúngr gekk út á skeið sína, lèt þá binda sár sitt, en þar rann blóð svâ mjök at eigi varð stöðvat, ok er á leið dag, úmætti konúng; sagði hann þá at hann vill fara norðr á Alreksstaði til bús síns; en er þeir komu norðr at Hákonar hellu, lögðo þeir þar at landi, var konúngr þá nær líflâti, kallaði hann þá til sín vini sína, ok segir þeim skipan þá sem hann vildi á gera um ríkit; hann átti dóttur eina barna er Þóra hèt, en engan son; bað hann senda þau orð Eiríks sonum at þeir skyldi konúngar vera yfir Noregi, en beiddi af þeim virkta vinum sínum ok frændum; en þó at mèr verði lífs auðit, segir hann, þá skal ek fara til kristinna manna, ok bæta þat er ek hefir misgert við guð, en ef ek dey hèr í heiðni, þá veitit mèr gröpt slíkan sem yðr sýnist; Litlu síðan andaðist Hákon konúngr þar á hellunni, sem hann hafði fæddr verit.. Hákon konúngr var svâ harmaðr at bæði vinir hans ok úvinir grètu dauða hans, ok sögðo at eigi mundi jafngóðr konúngr koma síþan í Noreg. Vinir hans fluttu

lík hans norðr á Sæheim á Norðr-Hörðaland, gerðu þar haug mikinn, ok lögðo þar í konúng með alvæpni sitt ok enn bezta búnat en ekki fè annat; mælto svâ firir grepti hans sem heiðinna siðr var til.

Gunnhildar synir tóku ríki.

Eiríks synir tóko konúngdóm yfir Noregi, þá er Hákon var dauðr; var Haraldr mest fur þeim at virþingu, var hann ok elztr þeirra bræðra er þá lifðo. Gunnhildr módir þeirra hafði mjök landráð með þeim; hún var þá köllut konúnga móþir. Þá voro höfþingjar í Noregi: Tryggvi konúngr Ólafsson austr í Vík, Guþröðr konúngr Bjarnarson á Vestfold, Sigurðr Hlaða jarl norðr í Þrándheimi. Gunnhildar synir höfðo midt landit hinn fursta vetr; fóro þá orð ok sendimenn milli Gunnhildar sona ok þeirra Tryggva ok Guðraðar, ok var þar mælt til sætta at þeir skyldo halda þvílíkan lut ríkis af Gunnhildar sonum, sem þeir höfdo áðr haft af Hákoni konúngi. Glúmr Geirason var skáld Haralds konúngs Gunnhildar sonar, hann orti vísu þessa eptir fall Hákonar konúngs, ok hældi þar, at Haraldr konúngr hefði hefnt Gamla bróðr síns:

Vel hefir hefnt en hafna
hjörs ben draugar fjörvi
fólkrakkr vann fylkir
framligt Haraldr Gamla:
er dökkvalir drekka
dólg bands fur ver handan
roðin frá ek rauðra benja
reyr Hákonar dreyra.

Þessi vísa varð allkjær í hirð Haralds konúngs. En er þat spurði Eyvindr Finnsson, þá kvað hann aðra vísu í móti:

Fyrr rauð fenris varra
flugvarr konúngr sparra
málmhríþar svall meiðum
móð í Gamla blóði;
þá er ústirfinn arfa
Eiríks of rak geira
nú tregar gæti gauta
grams fall á seá alla.

Var su vísa ok mjök flutt. En er þat spurði Haraldr konúngr,

gaf hann þar firir Eyvindi dauða sök, þar til er vinir þeirra sættu þá með því móti, at Eyvindr skyldi görast skáld Haralds konúngs, sem hann hafði áðr verit Hákonar konúngs; var ok frændsemi mikil milli þeirra, svá at Eyvindr var sonr Gunnhildar dóttur Hálfdánar jarls sem áðr er sagt, en móðir Gunnhildar var Ingibjörg, dóttir Haralds konúngs Hárfagra. Eyvindr orti þá vísu um Harald konúng:

Lítt kváðu þik láta,
landvörðr, er brast Hörða
benja hagl á brynjum,
bugust álmar, geð fálma;
þá er ófólginn ylgjar
endr or þinni hendi
fetla svell til fyllar
full egg, Haraldr! gullu.

VI.

Hervara at the tomb of Angantyr.

HERVARAR SAGA.

VII.

Sídan biost hun i burtu einsaman ok tok ser kallmanns giörvi ok vopn, ok sókti þar til er víkingar nokrir voru; nefndist hun þá Hervardr, kom hun ser i sveit med þeim, ok littlu sidar dó hófdingi víkinga ok tók hun forrædi lidsens; heriadi nu Hiörvardr þessi um lönd vida, ok hellt at liktum til Samseyar, ok sem víkingar höfdu höfn tekit, beiddist Hiörvardr at fara upp á eyna, ok sagdi þar mundi vera fiár von i haugi; allir lids menn mæla í möti ok segia, at sva miklir meinvættir gangi þar öll dægr, at þar er verra um daga, enn vída um nætr annarstadar; enn þo fekst þat um sídir, at atkerum var i grunn kastat, at liggia þar um nottina; enn Hiörvardr tók ser bát, ok reri til lands, ok lendti i Munarvogi i þann tíma er sol settist; geck hann sídan á land upp, þar hitti hann einn mann, er hiördn hellt mæltust þaú vid um hríd, ok spurdi hun hann tídinda, hann svarar, er þer ókunnugt her i eyunni, ok gak heim med mer, því at her dugir eingum manni úti at vera eptir solar setur, ok vil ek skiótt heim fara. Hiörvardr svarar, seg mer

hvar Hiörvards haugar heita. Sveirninn svarar: vanfarinn ertu, er þu vilt þat forvitnast um nætur, er fár þorir á midium dögum, ok brennandi elldr leikur þar yfir, þegar sól geingur undir. Hiörvardr kvedst at vísu skyldi vitia hauganna. Fehirdir mælti: ek se at þu ert dreingiligr madr, þo at þu sert uviti, þá vil ek gefa þer men mitt ok filg mer heim. Hiörvardr segir: þö at þu gefir mer allt þat er þu átt, þá fær þu mik eigi dvalit. Enn er sölin settist, giördust dunur miklar út á eyna, ok lupu upp hauga elldarnir; þá ræddist fehirdir, ok vildi skunda heim ok sagdi þat væri eingin sidur manna, at vera úti á sídkvölldum. Hiörvardr dvaldi hann ok spurdi hann almæltra tídinda af eyunni, ok bad hann fara med ser; þá tók fehirdir til fóta, ok liop i skoginn sem mest mátti hann ok sá alldri aptr, þetta er kvedit um vidrædu þeirra.

* * * * *

Nu ser Hervör þvi næst út á eyna, hvar hauga elldarnir brenna, ok haug bua uti standa, ok geingr hun þángat, ok hrædist þat eigi, þótt allir haugar brinni á götu hennar, ok ód hun þá fram, sem mirkva þoku, þar til hún kom at haugum Berserkianna, snír hun þá at hinum stædsta haugnum og kvad:

Vaki þu Angantyr!
vekr þik Hervör,
einka dottir
yckar Svafu;
seldu mer úr haugi
hvassann mæki
þann er Svafurlama
slóu dvergar.
Hervardr; Hiörvardr,
Hrani, Angantyr;
vek ek ydr alla
undir vidar rótum
Hiálmi ok briniu
ok hvössu sverdi,
röndum skriddir
ok rodnum geiri.
Miög erut ordnir
Arngrímssynir,
meiginn meingiarnir,
at molldar auka
er eingi giörir
sona Eyfuru
vid mik mæla
í Munarvogi.
Hiörvardr, Hervardr
Hrani, Angantyr!
sva se ydur öllum
innan rifia;
sem þer i maura
mornit haugi;
nema sverd seliet mer
þat er sló Dvalin.
samyra draugum
dírt vopn bera.

Þá kvad Angantyr:

Hervör dottir!
hvat kallar þu sva?
full feikn stafa,
fer þu þer at illu,
ær ertu ordinn
ok örvita
vill hyggiandi

vekr menn dauda.
grofat mik fadir
ne frændur adrir;
þeir höfdu Tyrfing
tveir er lifdu;
vard þo eigandi
einn um sídir.

Hun kvad:

Segir þu eigi satt
sva láti A's þik
heilan i haugi sitia;
sem þu hefir

eigi Tyrfing;
traudr ertu
arf at veita
einu barni.

Þá opnast haugrinn, ok var at siá, sem elldr ok logi væri um allan hauginn, þa kvad Angantyr:

Hnígín er helgrind,
haugar opnast,
allr er i elldi
ey barmr at sia;

ok allt er úti
Um at lítast;
skyntu mær ef þu mátt
til skipa pínua.

* * * * *

Þá kvad Angantyr:

Heimsk ertu Hervör
hugar eigandi,
er þu at augum
i elld hrapar;

víl ek helldr selia þér
sverd ur haugi,
mær hin unga
makat ek þer synia.

Var þá kastad út sverdinu i hönd Hervarar.

* * * * *

Hun kvad:

Bui þer allir
brott fysir mik
heilir í haugi
hedan vil ek skiótla,

hellst þóttunst nu
heima i millum;
er mik umhverfis
elldar brunnu.

Hervör fór nu ofan til strandar, ok er dagadi, sá hun at skip voru i burt, ok höfdu víkingar hrædst, er þeir heirdu dunur ok sáu ellda brenna, dvaldist hun nu i Samsey til þess er hun fek ser far i burt, er nu ei sagt fra ferdum hennar, fyrr enn hún kom til Godmundar kongs á Glæsis völlum, ok var þar um ve-

turinn, hun nefndist þá enn Hervardr, ok liest vera ein kiempa; þessi Hervardr var þar einkanlega vel tekinn.

VII.

OLD DANISH.

Skaanske Kirkelov.*

De presbitero eligendo.

Kirkiæ um lös warther, böndor skulu meth biscops wiliæ prest til wæliæ. Hittir prest at misgöræ with bonda, böte brut sin, nyti kirkiu sinnæ. Böndor mughu æi præst wrækæ, ok æi ma han utan theræ wiliæ with skiliæs.

De occulto homicidio.

Æn a thessi lund aghu Skra at faræ. Warthar man wæghin, ok gangar ængin with, tha a hin æthæ söchia wil, ni mæn mæth iarni at sökiæ, ok sithan lati han i ban sætiæ. Wil han nokrum manni a hand sökiæ, tha swæriæ a hand hanum mæth tolf lagfastum mannum, ok hin gange a sak sithan. Swa ok um troldom, ællæ fordæthær.

De legatis.

Æn om man liggir a dötha dighi, ok giuir han guthi egn sina, tha ma han giua haluan houoth lot sin, ok æi i sottum meræ. Æn um thæt wil dylia arui hans at hanum döthum,

* A. D. 1141.

Siællandske Kirkelov.†

Um Kirke worther löös.

Vorther kirkæ lös, tha skullæ kirkæ men præst til takæ meth biscops villiæ. Bruther prest vether sinæ kirkæ men, tha bötæ sinæ brötæ æfther sinæ gerningæ, oc væræ veth sin kirkæ. Bönder aghæ ey prest at vrakæ, oc ey ma han vether them skilliæs vthen therræs villiæ.

Um mord oc tröldom.

Tetti er ræth um skra. Vortær man drapæn, och gor ther engæn man vether, tha a hin ther theth vil sökæ, ni mæn til næfnd at kommæ, och sikæn latæ han bansætiæ. Æn vil han then tindæ man a hændær sökæ, tha skal han swæriæ hanum a hand meth tolf lagfestæ mæn, och hin væriæ sik meth næfnd. Thet samæ er logh um troldom eller um forgiærninggæ.

Um man wil gifuæ i sutæ sængh.

Wil nokær gifuæ i soth, tha a han ey mer at giuæ, en half sin houeth loeth. Æn um hans aruingæ villiæ duliæ (negte) teth efther hannum dötæn, och siær presth enæ

† A. D. 1170.

ok sighir prest en at giuit war, tha dyli thæt arui mæth tolf lagfastum mannum. Æn um thet witna the, ær a hörthu oc withir satu, ok will tho æn aruir igen witna, dylia tha witi mæth tolf næfdum mannum i kirkiu sokn. Æn um hel man wil sik ingiuæ, tha fari in, um han wil, mæth allum houoth lot sinum. ath teth war gifueth, tha mughæ aruingæ teth duliæ meth tolf laugfestæ mæn. Æn er ther tuiggæ mannæ vitnæ til, ther a hördæ, tha mughæ aruingæ duliæ teth meth næfnd i kirkæ soghn. Wil man hel (sund) i closter faræ, tha ma han in faræ meth ald sin houeth loeth.

VIII.

MIDDLE DANISH.*

Hwer koning oc hwer mæchtig man
burde them at ære, som scriffue kan;
Forthi at hwad som manneligh görs,
i frem tijdh theth ey lengæ spörs;
men bliffuer snart meth allæ forglömth,
wthen theth worder i scriffthen gömth.
Dog ieg i myn tijdh megeth bedreff,
tha hade iegh inghen som ther aff screff.
Bland andræ koningæ stor (staaer) ieg saa,
som theth træ ey frwcht ær paa.

IX.

MODERN SWEDISH.

FRITHIOFS SAGA.

XI.

Frithiof hos Angantyr.

1.

Nu är att säga huru
Jarl Angantyr satt än;
Uti sin sal af furu,
Ock drack med sina män:
Han var så glad i hågen,
Säg ut åt blånad ban,
Der solen sjunk i vägen,
Allt som än gyllne svan.

2.

Vid fönstret, gamle Halvar
Stod utanför på vakt;
Hann vaktade med allvar,
Gaf ock på mjödet akt.
En sed den gamle hade;
Hann jemt i botten drack;
Ock intet ord hann sade;
Blott hornett i hann stack.

* Danske Rümkronik, A. D. 1495.

3.

Nu slängde han det vida
I salen in och qvad,
" Skepp ser jag böljan rida;
" Den färden är ej glad.
" Män ser jag döden nära,
" Nu lägga de i land:
" Ock tvenne jättar bära
" De bleknade på strand."

4.

Utöfver böljans spegel,
Från salen Jarl såg ned:
" Det är Ellidas segel,
" Och Frithiof, tror jag, med.
" På gången och på pannan,
" Känns Thorstens son igen:
" Så blickar ingen annan
" I Nordens land som den."

5.

Från dryckesbord helt modig
Sprang Atle Viking då:
Svartskäggig Berserk, blodig
Ock grym at se uppå.
" Nu, sad' han, vil jag pröfva,
" Hvad rycktet ment dermed,
" At Frithiof svärd kann döfva;
" Och alldrig ber om fred."

6.

Och upp med honom sprungo
Hanns bistra kämpar tolf:
Med forhand luften stungo,
Och svängde svärd och kolf.
De stormade mot stranden,
Hvor tröttadt drakskepp stod.
Men Frithiof satt å sanden
Ock talte kraft och mod.

7.

" Lätt kunde jag dig fälla,"
Skrek Atle med stort gny.
" Vill i ditt val dock ställa,
" Att kämpa eller fly.
" Men blott om fred du beder
" Fastän än kämpe härd,
" Jag som än vän dig leder,
" Allt up til Jarlens gärd."

8.

" Väl är jag trött af färden;"
Genmälte Frithiof vred,
" Dock må vi pröfva svärden,
" Förr än jag tigger fred."
Då såg man stålen ljunga,
I solbrun kämpehand;
På Angurvadels tunga,
Hvar runa stod i brand.

9.

Nu skiftas svärdshugg dryga,
Och dräpslag hagla nu;
Och begges skjöldar flyga,
På samma gång itu.
De kämpar utan tadel
Stå dock i kredsen fast;
Men skarpt bet Angurvadel,
Och Atles klinga brast.

10.

" Mod svärdlös man jag svänger,"
Sad Frithiof, " ej mitt svärd."
Men lyster det dig länger,
Vi pröfva annan färd.
Som vågor då om hösten,
De begge storma an;
Ock ståltbeklädda brösten,
Slå tätt emot hvarann.

11.

De brottades som björnar,
Uppå sitt fjäll af snö;
De spände hop som örnar,
Utöfver vredgad sjö.
Rodfästad klippa hölle
Vel knappast ut att stå;
Ock lummig jernek fölle
För mindre tag än så.

12.

Från pannan svetten lackar,
Och bröstet häfves kallt;
Och buskar, sten, ock backar,
Uppsparkas öfver allt.
Med bäfvän slutet bida
Ställklädde män å strand;
Det brottandet var vida
Berömdt i Nordens land.

13.

Til slut dock Frithiof fällde
Sin fiende til jord:
Hann knät mod bröstet ställde,
Och tallte vredens ord.
" Blott nu mitt svärd jag hade,
" Du svarte Berserksskägg,
" Jag genom lifvet lade,
" På dig den hvassa ägg.

14.

" Det skal ei hinder bringa,"
Sad Atle stolt i häg,
" Gå du, ock ta din klinga,
" Jag licgar som jag läg.
" Den ena, som den andra,
" Skal engång Valhall se:
" Idag skal jag väl vandra;
" I morgon du kanske."

15.

Ei lange Frithiof dröjde;
Den lek han sluta vill:
Han Angurvadel höjde;
Men Atle läg dock still.
Det rörde hjeltens sinne;
Sin vrede då hann band;
Höll midt i huggett inne,
Ock tog den fallnes hand.

ERRATA.

P. 80, *l.* 17; for *Liegar*, read *Liegan*.
112, *l.* 20; *column* 3; for *note*, read *not*.
179, *l.* 10; for *Appendix B*, read *Appendix C*.
262, *l.* 31; for xxii, read xxi.

London: Printed by S. Bentley, Bangor House, Shoe Lane.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE,
Delivered at University College, London, October 1839. 8vo. Price 1s.

FRITHIOF. A Poem.
From the Swedish of ESAIAS TEGNER. Price 6s. 6d.

AXEL. A Poem.
From the Swedish of ESAIAS TEGNER. Price 2s. 6d.

00069341

Digitized with financial assistance from
Shri Brihad Bhartiya Samaj
on 11 March, 2020